PP-22

# Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

## CC Docket No. 92-297

In the Matters of

in the Matters of	
Rulemaking to Amend Part 1 and Part 21 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5 - 29.5 GHz Frequency Band and to Establish Rules and Policies for	RM-7872; RM-7722
Local Multipoint Distribution Service;	
Applications for Waiver of the Commission's Common Carrier Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service Rules; <sup>1</sup>	

Suite 12 Group Petition for Pioneer's Preference:

University of Texas - Pan American Petition for Reconsideration of Pioneer's Preference Request Denial

## NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING, ORDER, TENTATIVE DECISION AND ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION

Adopted: December 10, 1992; Released: January 8, 1993

Comment Date: March 16, 1993 Reply Comment Date: April 15, 1993

By the Commission:

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subject Pa	ragraphs
I. Introduction	1-4
II. Background	5-13
III. Discussion	
LMDS Demand	14-19
Structure of the 28 GHz Band for Licensing	20-22
Technical Issues	23-24
Regulatory/Licensing Issues	
Status of Licensees	25-26
Regulation of Common Carriers	27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A list of applications identified to date is provided in Appendix C. Should any further waiver applications be identified in the future, we hereby delegate authority to the Common Carrier-Bureau to dismiss them in accordance with the holding in this Order.

Preemption	28-29
Service Areas	30-31
Service of minimum areas and/or populations	32
Cross-ownership	33-34
Selection from among mutually exclusive	
applicants	35-36
Preferences	37
Settlements	38
License term and transfer of control/	,
assignment	39-41
Application requirements	42-44
One-to-a-market	45
Financial showing	46-47
Construction requirement	48
Filing date	49
Fees	50
IV. Pending Applications	51-53
V. Pioneer's Preference	54-68
VI. Conclusion	69
VII. Procedural Matters	
Ex Parte Rules - Non-Restricted Proceeding	70
Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis	71-77
Comment Dates	78-79
Ordering Clauses	80-84

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Tentative Decision (NPRM) proposes a redesignation of use of the 28 GHz band from point-to-point microwave common carrier service to a local multipoint distribution service. In separate sections of this document, we address pending waiver applications in the Common Carrier Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service filed in anticipation of our action on the instant petitions for rulemaking, (Section IV). In addition, we address two petitions for pioneer's preference, one of which is before us on a petition for reconsideration of the staff's action dismissing the request. (Section V).

2. We initiate this NPRM in response to a petition filed by Suite 12 Group ("Suite 12"). a group of inventors who have engineered a millimeter wave component technology which can be used to offer video and other communications services in the 27.5 - 29.5 GHz frequency range ("28 GHz band"). We have received two other petitions for rulemaking which affect the 28 GHz band. In response to Suite 12's petition for rulemaking, Video/Phone Systems, Inc. (Video/Phone) proposes a Local Wireless Broadband Service (LWBS) for the 28 GHz band in a separate rulemaking petition. In addition, Harris Corporation (Farinon Division) (hereinafter "Harris") filed a petition for rulemaking (RM-7722) suggesting that the Commission implement a uniform channelization plan for the 28 GHz band so that equipment manufacturers would have a standard to apply for the development of new technology.

- 3. In this proceeding we propose to accommodate the Suite 12 and Video/Phone requests. The 28 GHz band is virtually unused, and the proposals before us, if developed to their apparent potential, will provide consumers with additional options by which to satisfy video and other telecommunications requirements. Among the primary regulatory objectives of this proceeding are providing applicants in this band sufficient flexibility to satisfy consumer demand, expediting service to the public, making more efficient use of essentially fallow spectrum, and streamlining the licensing process while deterring speculative applications. We propose licensing and regulatory policies that, in our experience, should serve these objectives. We seek comment on proposals to license two licensees in each area; adopt minimal technical rules to accommodate multipoint video programming distribution, wideband video. data, and other telecommunications services; require that service be available to 90% of the residents within a service area within 3 years; adopt one-day-filing; use lotteries or auctions to select licensees; and employ minority and diversity of ownership preferences. We also deny 971 pendwaiver applications that seek to establish point-to-multipoint video distribution services without benefit of the instant rulemaking to amend the current Common Carrier Point-to-Point Microwave Service rules.
- 4. Suite 12's and Video/Phone's proposed redesignation of the 28 GHz band is for a service which meets the generic standards of a multipoint distribution service. However, due to the novel technology which uses a cellular distribution format and a greatly expanded range of services which can be offered, we find that this service is separate and distinct from other types of multipoint distribution services. Accordingly, we propose to title the new service Local Multipoint Distribution Service (LMDS) and propose new rules suited to the technology and distribution format to be used.

## II. BACKGROUND

- 5. The 28 GHz band has been available for point-to-point microwave radio common carrier use since 1959. Nevertheless, until 1991, the only licensees for the 28 GHz band were for a few temporary fixed licenses authorized under Part 21. Very little, if any, common carrier point-to-point use of the frequency band has been made since 1959.<sup>2</sup>
- 6. In 1991, the Commission authorized a wholly-owned affiliate of Suite 12 to construct a system in the New York Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) using millimeter wave technology to provide video service. Hye Crest Management, Inc., 6 FCC Rcd 332 (1991). The application proposed a new fixed station in the 28 GHz band to provide 24 channel television service in New York City. The licensee, Hye Crest, was granted waivers of Sections 21.108 (directionalization and bandwidth requirements)

- and 21.700 (status eligibility). Hye Crest also received a designated service area, the New York PMSA. Hye Crest subsequently requested and received authorization for a major modification of its license to change the transmitter type to offer 49 television channels within 1000 MHz of spectrum. Hye Crest filed its Certification of Completion of Construction for its first facility located at Brighton Beach, New York (FCC Form 494A) on July 1, 1992. Hye Crest's authorization is for a five year period. Since granting Hye Crest's initial authorization, we have received 971 applications accompanied by petitions for waiver of the Commission's rules from entities seeking to provide service similar to that of Hye Crest around the nation. On October 29. 1992, the Common Carrier Bureau released an Order (In the Matter of Rulemaking to Amend Part 2 and 21 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5 - 29.5 GHz Frequency Band, and to Establish Rules and Policies for Multichannel Local Distribution Service, DA 92-1488) announcing that applications in the 28 GHz band would no longer be accepted for filing pending the outcome of the instant rulemaking proceeding.
- 7. As discussed above, three petitions for rulemaking were filed proposing a variety of uses for the 28 GHz band. The Harris and Suite 12 petitions were placed on public notice<sup>3</sup> for comment; the Video/Phone petition was a comment to the Suite 12 petition and was not placed separately on public notice.
- 8. Suite 12 Petition. Suite 12 states that the technology it proposes is "capable of immediately providing interactive high quality video, voice, and data services. . . ." It argues that LMDS will help meet the public demand for additional multichannel video programming and for two-way voice and data service. Suite 12 argues that the public will benefit from having an "innovative and competitive two-way interactive communications system" capable of providing the equivalent of fiber cable service without the need to wire a community. Suite 12 states that its system is capable of incorporating future technological advances such as high definition television and digital communications.
- 9. The system is a multicell configured distribution system with a return path capability. The video channels (20 MHz) are transmitted over 1 GHz of spectrum with the same polarization. Two-way communication channels are inserted between the video channels and are transmitted with opposite polarity. The system uses an omni-directional antenna to transmit from the node, or center of the cell. The subscriber's receiver antenna uses a narrow beamwidth to eliminate multipath reception and to obtain sufficient link margin for service. Each cell is designed to be between 6 to 12 miles in diameter, and shadowed areas are served with a repeater or reflector. The system avoids interference between adjacent cells by cross-polarizing the signals and by taking advantage of the discrimination provided by the

in 100 mile radius of several major metropolitan areas on frequencies 29.242 GHz +/- 20.5 MHz, 29.263 GHz +/- 82.5 MHz and 29.298 GHz +/- 20.5 MHz. See paragraph 22, infra.

<sup>3</sup> Petition for Rulemaking filed by Harris Corporation (Farinon Division), RM 7722, Public Notice Report No. 1845, released May 15, 1991; Petition for Rulemaking filed by Suite 12 Group, RM 7872, Public Notice Report No. 21049, released December 16, 1991.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We have received an application from Motorola Satellite Communications, Inc. to use 100 MHz within the 27.5 - 30 GHz band for gateway/control satellite uplinks in the fixed satellite service (FSS) to support its proposed "Iridium" low earth orbit mobile satellite service. (File Nos. 9-DSS-P-91(87) and CSS-91-010, Public Notice date April 1, 1991, Report No. DS-1068). In addition, the NASA Advanced Communications Technology Satellite (ACTS) is scheduled to be launched in June or July 1993. This satellite will operate from 100\$ W.L. with 29-30 GHz uplinks and 19.2 - 20.1 GHz downlinks. This program intends to provide several services including T-1 VSAT networks with-

subscriber receiving antenna. Suite 12 states that its system makes exceptionally efficient use of the frequency spectrum.

- 10. Video/Phone Petition. Video/Phone is supportive of Suite 12's technology but criticizes it for confining its suggested rules only to video programming service, with secondary communications services. Video/Phone proposes that a Local Wireless Broadband Service would respond to the growing demand for video telecommunications services such as videoconferencing, telecommuting, telemedicine, and education. Video/Phone argues that the lack of economic transmission capability at the local loop has heretofore hindered the growth of these services, which it argues, would have been substantial. Accordingly, Video/Phone proposes rules intended to permit flexible use of the 28 GHz spectrum and Suite 12's technology to provide a wide variety of communication services to the public.
- 11. Harris Petition. Harris proposes that the Commission amend Parts 2, 21, and 94 of the Rules to adopt a channelization plan with multiple bandwidth options for the 28 GHz band and to make the band available for assignment to private carriers under Part 94. Harris argues that manufacturers find it difficult to design and market equipment due to uncertainty regarding channel pairings, bandwidths, channel spacings, etc. Harris also argues that the Commission has adopted frequency sharing between private carriers and common carriers. Furthermore, Harris argues that broad eligibility rules will result in greater and more efficient use of the 28 GHz band. Harris argues that the band could be used to facilitate the implementation of personal communications services through the interconnection of microcells. Finally, Harris argues that private radio use should be permitted for the band because, it contends, the Operational Fixed Microwave Radio Service (OFS) bands below the 28 GHz band are heavily used.
- 12. Harris opposes Suite 12's proposal, arguing that there is an imminent need for point-to-point spectrum. If redesignation is undertaken, Harris suggests that LMDS assignments be limited to one half of the band and the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR) channelization plan be implemented so that multiple uses of the spectrum can be made, including point-to-point services. Harris provides no evidence of either manufacturer or subscriber interest in the 28 GHz band for conventional private or common carrier point-to-point use, however.
- 13. The Wireless Cable Association (WCA) believes that a redesignation is premature. It argues that wireless cable licensees in the Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service (MMDS) are at a competitive disadvantage because of their limited channel capacity. WCA also argues that the wireless cable operators are at a competitive disadvantage due to expansion of telephone companies into video dialtone, and the entrance of franchised cable operators into two-way voice and data services. It contends lack of available spectrum for wireless cable operators has been a brake to their expansion into both video and two-way communications services. Accordingly, WCA is interested in the use of the 28 GHz band for wireless cable operators. Nevertheless, WCA argues that Suite 12 has failed to produce test results into the record that would establish the viability of

its system. Finally, WCA argues that if the 28 GHz band is redesignated for Suite 12's technology, that the public interest may be best served by setting aside spectrum for local wireless cable operators to expand.

#### III. DISCUSSION

## LMDS Demand

- 14. We believe that the record compiled thus far establishes that 1) the 28 GHz band is not being utilized; 2) Suite 12 and others have demonstrated an interest and ability to use it; 3) the most likely use will be to provide video programming, and that such use will serve the public interest, and 4) we should not limit the use of the band only to video service.
- 15. Technological advances in the use of radio technology are making possible wider use of spectrum in lower bands and opening use of the higher frequency bands not heretofore possible. One of these advances has been made by Suite 12, which has developed and patented the equipment it hopes to place in subscribers' homes. Suite 12's representations that the proposed redesignation will serve the public interest are supported by its bringing LMDS service to Brighton Beach. In addition, the number of applications received seeking to provide similar service indicates a significant interest in both the technology and the service. Coupled with the volume of public inquiry regarding the service, we find that there is strong public interest in the proposed redesignation.
- 16. The interest in spectrum for video services, as evidenced by Suite 12's developmental work and the growth of conventional cable subscribership,4 supports a tentative conclusion that video programming will be the largest and most commercially significant use of this spectrum at this time. Moreover, such use of the 28 GHz band would provide additional competition to franchised cable companies. A new source of competition for franchised cable companies, wireless cable companies, and other video service providers furthers our goal of using the disciplines of the marketplace to regulate the price, type, quality and quantity of video services available to the public. Accordingly, we propose to redesignate the 28 GHz band fixed service allocation to any video or telecommunications use on either or both the vertical and horizontal polarization planes of the assigned frequency, which the public may require in a particular location.
- 17. We intend that the rules we promulgate in this proceeding reflect the maximum flexibility for licensees to construct communications systems in which the public is interested. Suite 12's technology offers the promise for a wide variety of applications that could be tailored to local interests. In this sense, it responds to Video/Phone's concerns, because the uses for the 28 GHz band it proposes could be incorporated into service capabilities of the multicell technology if local demand warrants. We therefore seek to establish rules that provide adequate spectrum for multipoint video programming distribution services and to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> In the last decade, the number of households subscribing to conventional cable television service has increased from 21 million in 1982 to 53 million in 1992. 1992 Television and Cable Fact Book, Cable and Services Vol. 60, p. G-64.

provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate different types of point-to-point and point-to-multipoint communications services.

18. WCA's concern that licensees in the Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service will face undesirable competition during its start-up period is unsupported. The existing industry has had a de facto head start which moots WCA's concern. We have granted more than 900 applications for wireless cable licenses to date, while potential LMDS licensing awaits this rulemaking proceeding, and video dialtone applications are only now being filed. Thus, MMDS wireless cable systems have had, and will continue to have, a significant opportunity to develop and refine their services and to establish market position.

19. WCA proposed that we set aside a portion of the 28 GHz band for MMDS operators because one of the obstacles facing the MMDS industry is acquiring enough spectrum to provide a service competitive with the franchised cable systems. We do not perceive a compelling public interest justification for setting aside 28 GHz spectrum for MMDS system operators. We have recently allocated additional spectrum for wireless cable operators. Second Report and Order, Gen. Docket No. 90-54, 6 FCC Rcd 6792 (1991). We also have proposed rule changes to expedite processing. Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in PR Docket No. 92-80, 7 FCC Rcd 3266 (1992). Accordingly, we do not propose to set aside any portion of the 28 GHz band for MMDS licensees, but we invite comments to address this tentative conclusion, focussing particularly on whether the public interest would be served by a set-aside.6

## Structure of 28 GHz Band

20. We propose, in accordance with Suite 12's and Video/Phone's suggestion, that the 28 GHz band initially be licensed in two blocks of 1000 megahertz each to two different carriers. Each assignment will be optimized on a cell by cell basis, for video services on the one (horizontal/vertical) polarization, and for other services on the other (vertical/horizontal) polarization. Suite 12's patented technology, the only equipment which appears to be capable of providing direct customer services in the 28 GHz band at this time, uses channels of 20 MHz to provide video service. Since it appears that video service will be, at least initially, the primary service offered in LMDS, we propose to divide each 1000 megahertz band into channels of 20 MHz each; licensees of the respective blocks will then have flexibility to use or lease portions of one or both polarization directions in each cell and to provide a wide variety of services. Thus, each licensee will be able to provide a minimum of 49 video programming channels to the public using the full 1000 megahertz assignment on one polarization direction in each cell. Licensees will also have the opportunity to supplement their video programming with telecommunications services (such as point to multipoint video, data or telephony services) on the full 1000 megahertz assignment by using the opposite polariza-

- 21. We also seek comment on whether other assignment schemes might better meet our objectives. For example, four blocks of spectrum could be assigned to different licensees instead of two blocks. In this scheme, two larger blocks of spectrum, enough to offer about 34 video channels, could each be assigned to new licensees for LMDS video programming services, and the two smaller blocks of spectrum could each be assigned to other users, possibly to applicants proposing only telecommunications services or a smaller video system. Other assignment schemes may also offer the possibility of providing either additional video programming competition or telecommunications options for subscribers as needs and markets develop in an area.
- 22. We also seek comment on whether a separate assignment is specifically required to accommodate the proposed satellite service applications in this band or whether adequate coordination and sharing criteria could be developed to permit both terrestrial and fixed satellite services to operate compatibly in the band. None of the commenters discussed existing or proposed satellite use of the band. Normally the Fixed Satellite Service can share with point to point services in an area, as evidenced by the successful sharing of the 4/6 GHz band. However, the multicell multipoint configurations in this proposal envision a wide area distribution of services which may foreclose the possibility of acceptable sharing conditions between satellite and terrestrial services. Proposed satellite use (see note 1, supra) is focused in the B-Band (28.5 29.5 GHz) segment.

## Technical issues

23. The Commission's technical regulations have in the past provided guidance to manufacturers as to the minimum specifications necessary for equipment type acceptance or certification for service. In addition, technical regulations are designed to ensure minimum service performance and facilitate spectrum management, interference control and coordination among individually licensed stations nationwide. Each licensee would have control over its own facilities within its designated service area and would therefore be responsible for minimum service performance and interference levels within its system. The licensee. however, may need to coordinate its operations with other entities licensed to provide service in adjacent designated areas to avoid mutual interference situations. Hence, we must establish regulations to facilitate interference control, spectrum management and coordination at the designated service area interfaces. In addition, coordination require-

use. Accordingly, we also seek comment on the probable relative demand of commercial video entertainment programming and educational or other non-commercial programming on the 28 GHz band and whether the Commission should consider reserving one-half of the spectrum for non-commercial use.

tion from the video service, and by using frequency offsets and the multicell point-to-multipoint distribution structure. This channelization plan provides licensees the flexibility to offer different telecommunications services in every cell in the designated authorized area to meet the demands of the marketplace for these services. The 27.5 - 28.5 GHz band will be designated the "A-Band," and the 28.5 -29.5 GHz band will be designated the "B-Band." We seek comment on this assignment scheme.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> In the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service (DPCRTS), the Commission set aside one-half the available spectrum for assignment to Local Exchange Carriers (LECs or wireline carriers) upon a finding of compelling public need for a wireline set-aside. *Cellular Lottery Order*, 98 FCC 2d 175 (1984).

The University of Texas has requested that we consider reserving one-half the available 28 GHz band for educational

ments and sharing criteria may need to be developed to reflect satellite use. Overall, however, we have an opportunity to be less restrictive in developing technical standards and to promote flexibility for the licensee to meet market demands of the consumer in the designated service area. Although we propose 20 MHz channels for licensing purposes, once licensed, the licensee would not be restricted to specific bandwidth, emission characteristics, etc. and could change the traffic mix within the frequency assignment to meet the requirements of the individual community served by a cell or multiple cells.

24. The three petitions propose a wide range of technical regulations, from a very detailed channelization plan with multiple bandwidth options to a more flexible approach which envisions no restrictions on bandwidth, channelization plan, emission or modulation characteristics. Since the petitions propose to provide licenses for stations over a limited geographical area corresponding to metropolitan statistical areas, they propose some restrictive technical standards and regulations. Given the propagation characteristics of the band, we believe only limited technical regulations may be needed to insure adequate interference control and coordination of services at the interfaces of the designated service areas within each 1000 MHz spectrum block. We seek comment on the need for technical standards, if any, and specific proposals for power, modulation requirements, channelization, bandwidth, emission characteristics, frequency stability, antenna characteristics, gain, beamwidth, height and polarization and spectrum utilization, as appropriate. We recognize the need to protect stations operating outside the frequency band. The emissions limitations in Part 21 appear to be sufficient to meet this concern. Spectrum utilization would address any questions of spectrum efficiency including minimum standards that should be enforced and how these standards should be determined. Parties should also consider whether technical rules should be adopted to accommodate existing and proposed satellite use of the band.

## Regulatory/Licensing Issues

25. Status of Licensees. Suite 12 suggested that the Commission authorize video service distributors in the 28 GHz band as non-common carriers, while Video/Phone proposed that parties be allowed to elect either common carrier or non-common carrier status. In National Association

of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. FCC, 525 F.2d 630 (D.C.Cir. 1976), the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit defined a non-common carrier as one whose practice is to make individualized decisions, in particular cases, whether and on what terms to deal, and who is under no compulsion to offer its services indifferently. A common carrier is one which holds itself out indifferently to serve those who seek to avail themselves of the carrier's particular services, or is under a legal compulsion to do so.

26. We have allowed service providers to elect common carrier or non-common carrier status in a number of radio services licensed by the Commission. For example, we have allowed licensees of satellite transponders to provide service as a non-common carrier entity. We also have allowed Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service licensees to choose their own status. We have found that doing so furthers the Commission's goals of ensuring that the communications needs of the public are met by allowing marketplace forces to shape the development of service providers. See, e.g., Wold Communications, Inc. v. FCC, 735 F.2d 1465 (D.C. Cir. 1984); Domestic Fixed-Satellite Transponder Sales, 90 FCC 2d 1238 (1982): Revision to Part 21, Report and Order, 2 FCC Rcd 4251, 4253 (1987). As we have done with MMDS, we propose that LMDS licensees choose whether they will operate as a common or noncommon carrier on a channel-by-channel and/or cell-bycell basis. We request comments on this issue, with particular emphasis on the effects status election would have on consumers.8 We also invite comment on the basis on which the selection should be made. In addition, we seek comment on whether the non-video services provided by LMDS licensees should be regulated as common carrier services,9 and on the jurisdictional implications of allowing election by a local exchange carrier of non-common carrier status in the proposed service. 10

27. Regulation of Common Carriers. We tentatively propose that LMDS operators electing common-carrier status for part or all of their systems should be classified as "non-dominant" carriers, and subject to streamlined tariff regulation as with MMDS. A non-dominant carrier is one which has insufficient market power to practice anti-competitive pricing. Id. Although we propose to reallocate a large quantity of spectrum to LMDS, and to assign each operator one gigahertz of spectrum, we tentatively conclude

<sup>7</sup> Coordination is required within the border areas with Canada and Mexico. We believe that in these circumstances regulations would be required to coordinate with our neighbors individual stations within 56 km of the border to insure interference protection to and from stations across the border.

With regard to notification of status election, parties should note the process currently used by MMDS licensees (47 C.F.R. § 21.900, ff.). We request interested parties to comment on the usefulness of these procedures for LMDS licensees.

See In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Gen. Docket No. 90-314, ET Docket No. 92-100) 7 FCC Rcd. 5676 (1992). We also seek comment on the application of our video dial tone policies to common carriers providing video services over LMDS.
To the extent that LMDS could be used as a resold tele-

To the extent that LMDS could be used as a resold telephone service, the Commission has determined that, under Section 332 of the Communications Act, a private land mobile radio licensee may not resell interconnected telephone service for profit. Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Prescribe Policies and Regulations to Govern the Interconnec-

tion of Private Land Mobile Radio Systems, 93 FCC 2d 1111, 1115 (1983), on recon., 49 Fed. Reg. 26066 (1984), aff'd by judgement sub nom. Telocator v. FCC, 764 F.2d 926 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (Table); In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, - FCC Rcd - (1992), Gen. Docket No. 90-314, (Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Tentative Decision) paras. 97-98, note 64. Accordingly, we ask for comment on this issue, in particular, whether LMDS could be classified as a resold telephone exchange service, whether LMDS licensees may operate as private land mobile radio licensees, and what implications operation of such resold telephone service by local exchange carriers (or others) operating as LMDS licensees would have.

History and prior citations noted in Policy and Rules Concerning Rates for Competitive Common Carrier Services and Facilities (Sixth Report and Order), 99 FCC2d 1020 (1985), rev'd and remanded sub. nom, MCI Telecommunications Corporation v. FCC, 765 F.2d 1186 (D.C. Cir. 1985); vacated in part, AT&T v. FCC, No. 92-1053 (D.C. Cir., November 13, 1992). Commenters should discuss the implications of our competitive carrier policies for participation in LMDS by telephone companies.

that both video and telecommunications services are so well represented in the marketplace that no LMDS operator will have a monopoly or near-monopoly position. For example, in the video distribution market, LMDS faces competition from MMDS, cable television, low-power television, domestic fixed satellites and broadcast television stations. Revisions to Part 21, supra. The telecommunications market includes long-distance telephone service, local exchange service, fixed cellular services, fixed satellite communications, private carriers, and Personal Communications Systems (PCS). Accordingly, it appears that LMDS, while it may find a market niche in particular areas, is unlikely to develop into a monopoly service. Should it do so, we could reassess its regulation.

28. Preemption. For LMDS licensees choosing non-common carrier status, "[p]reemption is primarily a function of the extent of the conflict between federal and state and local regulation." In the Matter of Federal Preemption of State and Local Regulations Pertaining to Amateur Radio Facilities, 101 FCC2d 952, 959 (1985). To the extent such systems provide video entertainment programming, we tentatively conclude that state entry and rate regulation should be preempted. Beyond that, at this stage, the record in this proceeding does not contain any information regarding the extent to which state and local regulations might conflict with provision of LMDS. State law which conflicts with the federal provisions must be preempted, Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul, 373 U.S. 132 (1963); however, we require a factual record on this subject prior to making any final preemption determination. Based on the rules proposed herein, and any additional rules, especially of a technical nature suggested by commenting parties, we request comment on the extent to which the Commission may be required to preempt state entry and/or rate regulation of LMDS licensees choosing non-common carrier sta-

29. For LMDS licensees choosing to maintain common carrier status, this Commission can preempt state regulation of video service since it is inherently interstate in nature. United States v. Southwestern Cable Co., 392 U.S. 157, 168-169 (1968); New York State Commission on Cable Television v. F.C.C., 669 F.2d 58, 65 (2d Cir. 1982). However, for LMDS licensees providing common carrier telecommunications services, we have jurisdiction only over interstate portions of those services, unless the intrastate services are not severable from the interstate services, and the state regulations thwart or impede federal law and policies. See, e.g., Louisiana PSC v. FCC, 476 U.S. 355, 375 n.4 (1986); National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. FCC, 880 F.2d 422 (D.C. Cir. 1989); Computer III Remand Proceedings, 6 FCC Rcd 7571, 7625-7637 (1991); Mobile Telecommunications Technologies Corporation, 7 FCC Rcd 4061 (1992). Accordingly, for LMDS telecommunications services, the first question we must consider in this proceeding is whether LMDS telecommunications services can be severed into intrastate and interstate components. If they cannot be severed, the Commission must show on a factual basis that potential state regulation would thwart or impede the Commission's interstate regulatory objectives for LMDS. Having incomplete technological information on the manner in which LMDS systems will operate, we are not in a position to determine at this time whether it is appropriate to preempt state entry and/or rate regulation of common carrier LMDS. Moreover, we do not have evidence that any particular state regulatory policies regarding inseverable intrastate LMDS

services would thwart or impede our efforts in establishing this new service. We request that parties, especially Suite 12 as the system inventor, and Video/Phone as the proponent of using the 28 GHz band for telecommunications services, provide information regarding the structure of system operations in light of our need to determine the interstate/intrastate nature of potential telecommunications services, and on whether any preemption of state regulation of intrastate common carrier non-video services is necessary.

30. Service Areas. We propose to license LMDS by the 487 "Basic Trading Areas" (BTAs) identified in the Rand McNally 1992 Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide, 123d edition, pp. 36-39 plus Alaska and Puerto Rico, for a total of 489 regional licenses encompassing all land areas within the United States. In Personal Communications Services -FCC Rcd - (1992), Gen. Docket No. 90-314, paragraphs 56 - 61 (Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Tentative Decision) (PCS NPRM) we discussed the relative benefits and drawbacks of smaller and larger service areas in connection with Personal Communications Services (PCS). Although PCS and LMDS are not necessarily similar services, a number of the considerations discussed in the PCS NPRM regarding BTAs as one of several options posed for that service may apply to LMDS as well. In particular, we are interested in facilitating natural market area licenses in order to achieve three goals. First, the Basic Trading Areas comprise areas within which consumers have a community of interest. Their use for licensing purposes reinforces this identity; a different scheme may not. Second, we wish to maximize the competitive strength of LMDS stations in order to provide as much competition in video distribution and telecommunications services as possible. We noted in Personal Communications Services that the cellular industry might have benefitted from larger initial licensing areas, since many licensees have expended large sums to combine metropolitan area and rural area licenses in consolidated systems. On the other hand, the costs associated with marketing and providing a new collection of LMDS services to the public may be prohibitive in larger population or geographic areas. We seek to find an appropriately-sized service area for LMDS in order to take advantage of economies of scale necessary to support a successful enterprise. Finally, we hope to facilitate applications processing. BTAs provide an easily identifiable and manageable number of discrete filing areas covering all areas of the country. Parties may also consider as alternatives to BTAs the 47 "Major Trading Areas" identified in the Rand McNally guide, supra, or smaller, cellular-type metropolitan and rural service areas, or Areas of Dominant Influence (ADI).

31. We request comment on the alternative proposals. Commenters should focus on the economies likely to be encountered with LMDS, both video and telecommunications services; the comparative costs of building LMDS systems in smaller and larger service areas; which type of licensing would be most likely to best serve expeditiously the needs of rural areas; and which approach would enhance speed of service to the public. Parties are invited to comment on the competitive implications of each alternative

32. Service of minimum areas and/or populations. In order to ensure that licensees fulfill their responsibility to use the radio spectrum efficiently and provide the best possible service to the public, we propose that within three years of being granted a license, licensees shall be capable of pro-

viding LMDS service to at least 90% of the population residing within the service area. We request comments on this proposal and welcome alternative suggestions.

33. Cross-Ownership. We do not propose to adopt crossownership restrictions unique to 28 GHz service. The Commission has imposed such rules in a variety of radio services (e.g., cable television cross ownership limitation in the Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service) to limit the ability of firms having market power from exploiting that position to engage in activity that restricts output, results in uneconomic pricing, or otherwise would deprive consumers of the full benefits of new entry. The evidence before us suggests' that the most likely first use of the 28 GHz band will be video entertainment programming, given Suite 12's experience and developmental activities. There is no assurance this will be the case, or that even if it is the predominant use, that it will be the most viable use in all geographic areas. In view of this uncertainty, we are inclined not to exclude any existing video distribution or telecommunications firm from constructing and operating 28 GHz facilities. We seek comment on our tentative policy conclusion that cross-ownership restrictions should not be imposed.

34. On the other hand, the recently-adopted Cable TV Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, P.L. 102-385, Section 11, generally prohibits cable operators from holding a license for "multichannel multipoint distribution service" in their own franchise areas. Although LMDS is not the Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service, the two services have many similarities, including the method of product distribution. Accordingly, it appears that the intent of Congress to facilitate competition in the video distribution services would include a ban on cable ownership of LMDS licenses if used to distribute video programming. 12 We solicit parties' comments on the interpretation of the cross-ownership prohibition on MMDS in the Cable Act as it applies to LMDS, and our tentative policy conclusion not to impose cross-ownership restrictions.13

35. Selection from among mutually exclusive applicants. The two traditional choices available for choosing from among mutually, exclusive applicants are comparative hearing and random selection. A third option, competitive bidding, may be available if Congress enacts enabling legislation. Comparative hearings may be either full administrative hearings or expedited hearings conducted primarily through a written record. Full administrative hearings are extremely costly and time-consuming. Expedited "paper" hearings, while not as costly in time and resources as full administrative hearings, are nevertheless cumbersome. For example, proceedings to license the top-30 cellular markets through expedited hearing procedures took approximately two years.

36. Because of our interest in making as many innovative, competitive services available to the public as quickly as possible, we propose to use random selection, or competitive bidding, if authority is provided by Congress, to choose among any mutually exclusive LMDS applications. We request comments on which method would be best suited to this service. We also ask for comment on the specific form any lotteries should take. In our recent Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the PCS service, we discussed ways in which the lottery system could be improved. We also asked questions on how to implement competitive bidding. PCS NPRM, supra, paras. 84 - 91. We ask for comment on these options in the context of this service.

37. Preferences. The Communications Act requires the Commission to ensure that any system of random selection "used for granting licenses or construction permits for any media of mass communications" gives significant preferences to applicants who own few other such licenses or who are members of a minority. 47 U.S.C. § 309(i)(3)(A). The Communications Act defines "media of mass communication" to include multipoint distribution service, "and other services, the licensed facilities of which may be substantially devoted toward providing programming or other information services within the editorial control of the licensee." 47 U.S.C. §309(i)(3)(C)(i). Accordingly, since LMDS appears to be a medium of mass communications, we tentatively conclude that preferences for diversity and minority interests are appropriate for LMDS. We request comment on this issue.

38. Settlements. Settlement between mutually exclusive applicants may avoid the need for comparative hearing or random selection procedures and reduce administrative burdens, delay and expense. See, e.g., Second Report and Order, Gen. Docket No. 80-112, 50 Fed. Reg. 5983-01, para. 41 (February 13, 1985) (MMDS Louery Order). However, our experience with cellular and MMDS licensing has shown that this purpose has not always been served by permitting settlements. To the contrary, the opportunity to settle is often perceived as making an application a "sure thing" in a game of chance, thus drawing thousands of insincere applicants hoping to profit from merely filing. Accordingly, the settlement rules have not promoted the public interest in licensing entities prepared to serve the public with needed communications services. 14 Thus, we propose to forbid any settlements among applicants for LMDS, and any alienation of interest in an application for LMDS. The rule we propose herein is based on the Part 22 Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service rule barring any alienation of interest in an application, and requires that each applicant file an independent, individual application. We welcome comment on our pro-

39. License Term and Transfer of Control/Assignment. To further ensure that only sincere applicants interested in constructing and operating LMDS systems apply, we propose that licensees be barred from transferring an LMDS license until the system has been constructed, and in fact is serving the public.

We also request parties' comments on the question of whether local exchange carriers operating as wireless cable companies on LMDS would have anti-competitive implications and if so, what regulatory responses would be appropriate.

if so, what regulatory responses would be appropriate.

To the extent that LMDS operators will provide video services, LMDS may be a "multichannel video programming distributor" under the Cable Act, Section 2(c)(12). If so, LMDS operators would have to comply with certain regulations that

the FCC may adopt consistent with that Act. Interested parties may want to participate in those Cable Act proceedings. In particular, parties should review the Notices of Proposed Rulemaking in MM Dockets 29-259 and 92-264.

Settlement rule changes have been proposed to reflect this new policy in Revision of Part 22 of the Commission's rules—governing\_the\_Public\_Mobile\_Services, 7—FCC\_Rcd\_3658,\_3665 (1992).

- 40. Finally, because this is a new and unproven service, we propose a five-year license term. Renewal applications will permit the Commission to monitor the evolution of the service. We propose to adopt renewal expectancy rules and request comment on the details of such rules. We request comments on this proposal, and on whether a license term of ten years would be more appropriate for this service.
- 41. Our proposals herein are similar to the rules adopted in *Interactive Video and Data Services*, 7 FCC Rcd 1630 (1992) (*IVDS*), recon pending. Our objective is to avoid having numerous applications filed by entities having no intention to provide service, but who only hope to profit from the transfer of an authorization. These insincere applications impose tremendous burdens on the Commission in terms of absorbing applications processing staff resources associated with extension of time requests and other filings designed to retain the license while the licensee tries to market the authorization. We ask commenters to consider our objective of limiting applicants to those ready, willing and able to provide service to the public.
- 42. Application requirements. We propose to adopt rules for application requirements similar to those used for cellular applications. Although these requirements demand vigilance and careful preparation on the part of applicants, the public interest is served because fewer processing delays contribute to licenses being made available as quickly as possible.
- 43. We propose that the standard to be met for LMDS applications be the "letter perfect" standard, rather than the present Part 21 standard of substantial compliance and opportunity to amend. The latter standard has proved to be administratively burdensome and may have contributed to delays in licensing MMDS stations. Accordingly, LMDS applicants not meeting the proposed rule's requirements would be dismissed rather than, under the current Part 21 practice, being allowed to perfect their applications. We propose that detailed review occur after a lottery is held. Parties are invited to comment on this proposal, with particular emphasis on expeditious licensing of qualified applicants.
- 44. As an alternative, we request comment on whether a "post-card" application, requiring minimal information about the applicant, would be appropriate for LMDS. No technical or financial information would be required to enter the random selection procedure; however, the applicant would be required to certify that it complies with all eligibility rules. Applicants chosen as tentative selectee would have 30 days to file a complete, letter-perfect application for the Commission's consideration.
- 45. One-to-a-Market. As with cellular licensing, we propose that only one application per market area could be filed by each applicant. We propose that no interest, direct or indirect, would be permitted in another application for the same market, including pre-existing settlement agreements or understandings, which in any event we propose to prohibit. Interests in bona fide publicly-held corporations of less than one percent would not be cognizable interests for the purpose of this proposed rule. Parties are invited to comment.
- 46. Financial showing. Due to the large amount of bandwidth which each licensee would receive, and the responsibility each licensee would have to serve a large area, we believe that applicants should give an indication of their'financial qualifications to construct and operate their

- proposed system. We propose to require applicants to meet the "firm financial commitment" standard which has been required of cellular applicants below the top 120 markets.
- 47. We propose that applicants be required to provide a proposal of service for 90% of the population within the service area within 3 years, a detailed business plan for meeting their plan of system construction and operation, and a showing of a firm financial commitment to construct the three year plan and to operate for one year after complete construction without additional revenue. Parties are invited to comment on this proposal.
- 48. Construction Requirement. To ensure that the public is served expeditiously, we propose to establish construction completion benchmarks. We propose to require that licenses be conditioned on constructing the system within three years of the date of license grant. Whenever any portion of the system is ready to begin operation, the conditional licensee must file a Form 494A. Notification of Completion of Construction. Thereafter, the licensee need not file any additional notifications until the entire system is constructed. At that point, a letter notification must be filed on or before the third anniversary of license grant. We do not propose to grant extensions of this requirement. We invite comment and further suggestions.
- 49. Filing Date. We propose to establish a one-calendarday filing opportunity for initial LMDS applications. We intend to announce a single date on which applications for each market area can be filed. This procedure would allow processing to go forward smoothly, with the Commission having foreknowledge of the amount of resources required to handle a known number of applications after the filing is completed. In addition, avoidance of the 60-day cut-off rule used for some other Part 21 applications will reduce the risk of "cookie-cutter" applications, i.e., mere copies of earlier filings, by insincere applicants. In addition, processing should be expedited due to the shortness of the filing period - the public would not have to wait any additional time for the cut-off deadlines to pass. We do not propose to reopen the filing period until all first round applications are processed. Parties are invited to comment.
- 50. Fees. Section 8(a) of the Communications Act sets forth fees the Commission may assess and collect for filing applications to aid in recovering some of its administrative costs. Because this service is a type of multipoint distribution service, the Multipoint Distribution Service (MDS) fee structure applies. In MDS, a licensee pays an initial fee of \$155 per station for a conditional license and \$455 per radio channel per station when certifying that construction has been completed. LMDS, as proposed herein, will accommodate 50 channels using Suite 12's technology. Thus, each LMDS applicant would pay \$155 per station in its single application for the blanket license for fifty channels in either the A-Band or the B-Band. In addition, upon completion of construction of one or more initial cells, a fee of \$455 for each of the fifty 20 MHz channels, or \$22,750, would be payable. No further fee would be due for constructing the remainder of the proposed LMDS system.

# IV. PENDING APPLICATIONS

51. We are also hereby denying the 971 waiver applications pending before us. All are based on existing point-to-point rules which are not structured to address the large amount of spectrum being allocated to individual licensees, nor the service area concept proposed herein, nor the

technical parameters, yet to be developed, of the new service. Instead, they seek waivers similar to those granted in *Hye Crest Management, Inc.*, para. 6, *supra*.

- 52. In Hye Crest Management, the Commission found that a formal rulemaking proceeding permanently real-locating the 28 GHz band for point-to-multipoint services would be premature. The Commission stated that grant of the waiver would not lead to a de facto reallocation of the band, and, based on similar waivers in the past, that it did not anticipate "an onslaught of waiver requests." Id. at 334. Applying the waiver standard established in Big Bend Telephone, 2 FCC Rcd 2413 (1986), the Commission found the waiver standard had been satisfied because "(3) the proposed use of the frequencies will not be detrimental to their assigned users;" 6 FCC Rcd at 334, para. 20.
- 53. Granting the several hundred waivers before us would amount to a *de facto* reallocation of the 28 GHz band, would be inconsistent with the Commission's suggestion that it would not grant a flood of such requests, and would be detrimental to the assigned users (potential common carrier point-to-point applicants) because spectrum awarded to waiver applicants would not be available to those assigned users. Large scale waivers also would run afoul of the guidance provided by the courts to the Commission in considering waivers, *e.g.*, that they not undermine the purpose of the rule being waived. *WAIT Radio*, 418 F.2d 1153 (D.C. Cir. 1969). We also see no basis for distinguishing among any of the individual requests in an equitable fashion.

## V. PIONEER'S PREFERENCE

- 54. Background. The Commission's pioneer's preference rules are a means of recognizing, in the Commission's licensing process, parties that develop new communications services or technologies. The underlying rationale for such rules is to foster the development of new services and improvements to existing services by reducing for innovators the delays and risks associated with the Commission's licensing processes. Innovators of substantial new communications services and technologies have an opportunity to participate either, in the new services that they took a lead in developing or in existing services with regard to which they took a lead in promoting application of new technologies. <sup>15</sup>
- 55. For each request before us, we have evaluated (1) whether the requester has demonstrated that its proposal constitutes a significant communications innovation; (2) whether it has made a significant contribution "in developing that innovation; and (3) whether the innovation reasonably will lead to establishment of a service not currently provided or substantially enhance an existing service. In applying these criteria, we employ the pioneer's preference standards set out in our rules and applied in our previous tentative decisions that consider award of pioneer's pref-

erences.<sup>16</sup> We consider whether a proposal is "to provide either a service not currently provided or a substantial enhancement to an existing service<sup>17</sup> by evaluating factors that include, but are not limited to, (1) added functionality; (2) new use of spectrum; (3) changed operating or technical characteristics; (4) increased spectrum efficiency; (5) increased speed or quality of information transfer; (6) technical feasibility; and (7) reduced cost to the public. In addition, to be eligible for a tentative award, at the time of the tentative decision a requester must have either received an experimental license and reported at least preliminary results, or submitted a written showing that demonstrates the technical feasibility of its proposal.<sup>18</sup>

- 56. Two pioneer's preference requests were filed in this proceeding. The first, filed by Suite 12, was accepted and placed on public notice on December 16, 1991. Comments and reply comments were received in January 1992. The second, filed by the University of Texas Pan American (UTPA), was submitted on May 1, 1992 and dismissed on June 18, 1992 for failure to include the information required by the pioneer's preference rules and which is necessary for a full and fair analysis of pioneering proposals. UTPA filed a petition for reconsideration on July 20, 1992.
- 57. Suite 12 Petition for Pioneer's Preference. Suite 12 requests a pioneer's preference as the innovator and developer of a new multichannel distribution technology -- the CellularVision system -- that is capable of providing multichannel one-way and two-way video. voice, and data services. Suite 12's companion petition for rulemaking to authorize LMDS in the 28 GHz band is based on its new multichannel distribution technology.
- 58. According to Suite 12, if authorized, LMDS will be the first wireless telecommunications service to employ millimeter wave transmissions on a point-to-multipoint basis and will offer one-way and two-way voice, video, and data applications within the same band of frequencies. Suite 12 states that the CellularVision system will be spectrum efficient because it will use cross-polarization isolation between adjacent cell transmitter sites -- transmitters at one cell will use vertical polarization and the adjacent cell transmitters will use horizontal polarization. Suite 12 asserts that in this manner the same frequencies will be used to connect adjacent cell sites, for the transmissions to subscribers, and for response channel transmissions from subscribers to cell sites.
- 59. Suite 12 asserts that it has undertaken detailed experimental programs to test its technology and that these experiments confirm that its equipment is fully functional and can be produced at costs that make LMDS economically feasible on a mass market basis. <sup>14</sup> It says that work on a prototype system began over six years ago and has culminated in the development of low cost, mass quantity production receivers and the building of transmitters.

These efforts are described in Suite 12's experimental license file, call signs KA2XLG and KA2XVG.

The pioneer's preference regulations are codified at 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.402, 1.403, and 5.207. See Establishment of Procedures to Provide a Preference, Report and Order, 6 FCC Rcd 3488 (1991), recon. granted in part, 7 FCC Rcd 1808 (1992), further recon. pending.

See, e.g., Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, supra, paras. 143-195.

<sup>17 6</sup> FCC Rcd 3488 at para. 49.

<sup>18</sup> Allocate Spectrum for Fixed and Mobile Satellite Services for Low-Earth Orbit Satellites, Tentative Decision, 7 FCC Rcd 1625 at para. 13 (1992); Establishment of Procedures to Provide a Preference, Reconsideration Order, supra, 7 FCC Rcd 1808 (1992), further recon, pending.

- 60. WCA opposes Suite 12's request for a pioneer's preference. WCA questions the feasibility of Suite 12's proposal, contending that substantial doubts exist as to the viability of Suite 12's system in the marketplace. In WCA's view, until those doubts are resolved, the Commission would be premature to award Suite 12 a pioneer's preference. WCA also argues that Suite 12 received what is tantamount to a pioneer's preference when the Commission granted Suite 12's wholly-owned affiliate, Hye Crest Management, a license (by waiver) to construct a one-way video transmission system using the 28 GHz band in the New York Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA).
- 61. In replying to WCA's opposition, Suite 12 argues that a report prepared for Suite 12 by the David Sarnoff Laboratories provides a comprehensive technical description of the viability of Suite 12's technology based on tests that the Sarnoff Laboratories performed. According to Suite 12, more than 50 companies and individuals have witnessed demonstrations of Suite 12's LMDS technology, and virtually all have felt sufficiently confident in its technical and market viability to seek licenses from Suite 12 to use it.
- 62. Suite 12 also maintains that Hye Crest's license is not tantamount to a pioneer's preference grant to Suite 12 because the waiver permits only a one-way video service. Because LMDS technology is capable of two-way voice and data applications in addition to one-way video, Suite 12 argues that it is seeking a pioneer's preference for a different and more sophisticated service than is the subject of the Hye Crest waiver. Suite 12 maintains that regardless of whether LMDS is viewed as a substantial enhancement of the service offered by Hye Crest or as a new service in its own right, it warrants a pioneer's preference.
- 63. Decision. The record demonstrates that Suite 12 is the innovator of LMDS technology and that other companies are seeking licenses to provide LMDS based on Suite 12's pioneering work. No party has challenged Suite 12's claims regarding its developmental efforts. Further, the rules proposed herein are based substantially on Suite 12's proposals in its petition for rule making. While WCA correctly observes that LMDS remains to be tested in the marketplace, the same is necessarily true of most technologies or services for which a pioneer's preference is considered. Therefore, we tentatively conclude that Suite 12 should be awarded a pioneer's preference.
- 64. Regarding WCA's concerns about Suite 12 already having received the equivalent of a pioneer's preference in the New York PMSA, we disagree with Suite 12 and believe that the service provided by Hye Crest in the New York City area is not substantially different from the service requested by Suite 12 for a pioneer's preference. While Suite 12 is eligible for a pioneer's preference for its proposal in this proceeding, we emphasize that a pioneer's preference for LMDS will not be awarded in more than one service area. Consequently, if a tentative preference to Suite 12 is confirmed, we will modify the authorization to Hye Crest to meet the service area, frequency, and other technical rules developed in this proceeding for the area

- encompassing Hye Crest's New York PMSA authorization. Alternatively, if Suite 12 informs the Commission that it prefers a preference in the Los Angeles area, 20 and that Hye Crest will surrender its New York PMSA authorization at the time of issuance to Suite 12 of any LMDS license for the service area encompassing Los Angeles, we will grant it a preference for Los Angeles.
- 65. For the above reasons, we tentatively conclude that Suite 12 should be awarded a pioneer's preference in either the New York or Los Angeles area. If the tentative preference is confirmed and Suite 12 is otherwise qualified, it would be the only eligible applicant for one of the frequency blocks for its preferred service area.
- 66. UTPA Petition for Reconsideration. In its pioneer's preference request UTPA stated that it plans to employ LMDS technology "to ameliorate a critical lack of educational opportunities for the residents of the Rio Grande Valley of Texas."<sup>21</sup> Specifically, UTPA proposes to employ LMDS in the Rio Grande Valley to provide two-way pointto-multipoint video distribution of various educational material. UTPA's petition was dismissed for failure to describe or otherwise document its role in having developed a specific distinctive innovation or new technology. The dismissal states that proposing a series of applications for a new technology developed by another party, in and of itself, does not meet the requirements for award of a pioneer's preference.22
- 67. In its petition for reconsideration, UTPA contends that "innovative applications of technical systems -- applied technology -- are often truly revolutionary and may, in any number of ways, affect quality of life even more significantly than the development of the underlying system."23 UTPA also maintains that its proposal would extend the potential of LMDS to a more advanced or effective state and thus meet the requirements of the pioneer's preference rules.
- 68. Decision. Our pioneer's preference rules require that an applicant "demonstrate that it (or its predecessor-ininterest) has developed the new service or technology; e.g., that it (or its predecessor-in-interest) has developed the capabilities or possibilities of the technology or service or has brought them to a more advanced or effective state" (emphasis added).<sup>24</sup> A pioneer's preference is to reward work already accomplished. Further, the work must be developmental in nature. In contrast to Suite 12, which has performed substantial developmental work and experimental testing of its LMDS technology, UTPA has provided no substantive information about any work that it has performed with regard to LMDS or similar technology. While we concur with UTPA that using Suite 12's technology to serve educational needs in the Rio Grande Valley potentially would confer substantial educational benefits on residents of this area and therefore would be commendable. the purpose of the pioneer's preference rules is not to select licensees for a service, but to reward innovative technical development. If the rules proposed herein are adopted and service is authorized generally, selecting the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> In its request for pioneer's preference filed on September 24, 1991, Suite 12 specified the San Francisco PMSA as its preferred preference area; however, in an amendment filed on November 19, 1991, Suite 12 changed its request to the Los Angeles PMSA, where it had received an experimental license.

See Petition for Pioneer's Preference, May 1, 1992, at 2. See letter of June 18, 1992 from Thomas P. Stanley to Steven D. Copold, at 1-2.

See Petition for Reconsideration, July 20, 1992, at 3.

<sup>47</sup> C.F.R. § 1.402(a). See Tentative Decision and Memorandum Opinion and Order, GEN Docket No. 90-314, released November 6, 1992, paras. 37-49.

licensees to provide such service will be accomplished pursuant to the regular governing selection regulations, and UTPA would be eligible to apply in the normal manner. Accordingly, we treat UTPA's Petition for Reconsideration as a Petition for Review and affirm the dismissal of UTPA's pioneer's preference request.

### VI. CONCLUSION

69. We tentatively conclude that the 28 GHz band should be redesignated to accommodate multipoint technology. We propose rules designed to foster the provision of innovative services for the public interest, convenience, and necessity. We invite public comment on the tentative conclusions addressed herein and on the rules set forth in Appendix B.

#### VII. PROCEDURAL MATTERS

## Ex Parte Rules - Non-Restricted Proceeding

70. The NPRM portion of this proceeding is a non-restricted notice and comment rulemaking proceeding. Exparte presentations are permitted, except "during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided they are disclosed as provided in Commission Rules. See generally 47 C.F.R. §§1.1202, 1.1203, and 1.1206(a). Because it has been formally opposed, Suite 12's request for a pioneer's preference is a restricted proceeding, and exparte presentations are prohibited. See 47 C.F.R. §1.1208. Similarly if University of Texas - Pan American's dismissed pioneer's preference request is opposed, it will also become a restricted proceeding. In addition, those waiver requests that are formally opposed or mutually exclusive are also restricted proceedings.

# Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

- 71. Reason for action. The purpose of this NPRM is to obtain comment on the change in the fixed service usage for the 28 GHz frequency band.
- 72. Objectives. The objective of this proposal is to consider licensing and service rules for the development and implementation of a new technology to provide video distribution and other telecommunications services to the public.
- 73. Legal basis. The authority for this action is the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §553; and sections 4(i), 4(j), 301, 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934 as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 145, 301, and 303(r).
- 74. Reporting, recordkeeping and other compliance requirements. Reporting requirements are proposed to ensure that the spectrum, if redesignated for these new uses, is used to serve the public's need for communications services.
- 75. Federal rules which overlap, duplicate or conflict with these rules. None.
- 76. Description, potential impact and number of small entities involved. Any rule changes in this proceeding could affect MMDS licensees, the majority of which are small businesses. These entities may have some additional competition from video programming service which could be provided by Suite 12's multicell technology. After evaluating the comments in this proceeding, the Commission will

further examine the impact of any rule changes on small entities and set forth our findings in the Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis.

77. Significant Alternatives. There are no presently available alternatives to the technology proposed by Suite 12.

#### **Comment Dates**

78. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in Sections 1.415 and 1.419 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before March 16, 1993, and reply comments on or before April 15, 1993. To file formally in this proceeding, you must file an original and five copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If you want each Commissioner to receive a personal copy of your comments, you must file an original plus nine copies. You should send comments and reply comments'to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available for public inspection during regular business hours in the Dockets Reference Room of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554.

79. For further information, contact Ms. Susan Magnotti, at (202) 634-1773, Domestic Facilities Division, Common Carrier Bureau.

## ORDERING CLAUSES

- 80. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED That the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is hereby adopted with proposed rules in Appendix B;
- 81. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the petition for reconsideration filed by University of Texas Pan American IS DENIED;
- 82. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the 971 pending applications in the Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service involving waiver requests listed in Appendix C ARE DENIED;
- 83. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That Suite 12 Group is tentatively granted a pioneer's preference in accordance with the discussion in paragraphs 63-65 of this document;
- 84. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Secretary shall mail a copy of this document to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Donna R. Searcy Secretary

## APPENDIX A

Petitioners for Rulemaking
Suite 12 Group
Video/Phone Systems, Inc.
Harris Corporation (Farinon Division)

Commenters to Suite 12 Group's Petition

Video/Phone Systems, Inc.

Harris Corporation (Farinon Division)

Wireless Cable Association, Inc.

Cross Country Wireless Cable I, L.P.

William B. Packer, Jr. (Packer Investments, Inc.)

Priscilla Marston

Dan Reiss, Esquire

Drake Darrin (Darrin Development Group)

William T. Lundberg (Alliance Associates)

Richard C. Woodbridge, Esquire

Robert G. Shepherd, Esquire

Charles S. Brand, President, Trontech Incorporated

Andrew Wahl (Markitstar)

Tom Brossard

David Jan Mitchell, Managing Partner, C/V Miami

## Commenters to Harris Corporation's Petition

Peninsula Engineering Group, Inc.

Suite 12 Group

Digital Microwave Corporation

TeleSciences, Inc.

Motorola Microwave

American Petroleum Institute

Calling Communications Corporation

## APPENDIX B

# **Proposed Rule Amendments**

Part 1 of Chapter I of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

Part 1 - Practice and Procedure

1. Subpart E -- Complaints, Applications, Tariffs, and Reports Involving Common Carriers is proposed to be amended as follows:

## 1.821 Scope

Add subparagraph (e):

(e) Local Multipoint Distribution Service.

A new Section 1.826 is proposed to be added as follows:

# 1.826 Random selection procedures for Local Multipoint Distribution Service.

(a) If there are mutually exclusive applications for an initial conditional license for a Local Multipoint Distribution Service license, the Commission may use the random selection process to select the conditional licensee. Each such random selection shall be conducted under the direction of the Chief of the Common Carrier Bureau. The designated Lottery Official shall select the winning applicant from among mutually exclusive applicants. Only one applicant shall be selected in each frequency block in a given market area. Following the random selection, the Commission shall announce the tentative selectee and determine whether the applicant is qualified to receive the

conditional license. If the Commission determines that the tentative selectee is qualified to receive the conditional license, it shall grant the application. In the event that the tentative selectee's application is denied, another random selection procedure will be conducted.

- (b) Competing applications for permits and licenses shall be designated for random selection in accordance with the procedures set forth at Sections 1.1621, 1.1622 (a), (b), (c) and (d), and 1.1623. No preferences pursuant to Sections 1.1622 (b)(2) or (b)(3) shall be granted to any LMDS applicant whose owners, when aggregated, have an ownership interest of more than fifty percent in a media of mass communications whose service areas, as set forth at Section 1.1622(e)(1) through (7), overlaps to any degree or is overlapped to any degree by the market area for which the conditional license is sought.
- (c) Petitions to Deny may be filed only against the tentative selectee. These petitions must be filed within 45 days of the Public Notice announcing such tentative selection. A consolidated reply may be filed within 30 days of the date for Petitions to Deny. Part 21 of Chapter I of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

# Part 21 - Domestic Public Fixed Radio Services

1. Subpart I -- Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service is proposed to be amended as follows:

## 21.701 Frequencies

Delete from table in subparagraph (a) the reference to 27,500--29,500 MHz and note 5.

## 21.703 Bandwidth and emission limitations.

Delete from table in subparagraph (a) the reference to 27,500--29,500 MHz.

2. A new Subpart L is proposed to be added as follows:

# 21.1000 Scope of Subpart

The rules in this subpart govern the licensing and operation of stations and systems in the Local Multipoint Distribution Service (LMDS). The licensing and operation of these stations and systems are also subject to rules elsewhere in this part that apply generally to Domestic Public Fixed Radio Services. However, in case of conflict, the rules in this subpart govern.

## 21.1001 Eligibility

- (a) Local Multipoint Distribution Service authorizations will be issued on either a common carrier or a non-common carrier basis, as requested by the applicant. Applications will be granted only where the applicant establishes:
- (1) it is legally, financially, technically, and otherwise qualified to render the services proposed;
- (2) the public interest, convenience and necessity would be served by such a grant; and
- (3) there are frequencies available to render the full range of services proposed in the application.

(b) Any applicant in the LMDS proposing to provide a medium of mass communication and desiring a preference in the random selection process, shall so indicate as part of its application.

## 21.1002 Frequencies

- (a) Frequencies in the band 27.5 29.5 GHz are available for LMDS. Within each service area (see § 21.1007) there are two frequency allocations which the Commission may license: A-Band (27.5 - 28.5 GHz) and B-Band (28.5 - 29.5 GHz). Although the spectrum allocated to each licensee is initially divided into 20 MHz channels, licensees may subdivide their assignments into channels of any bandwidth within either band subject to obtaining coordinations as described in paragraph (b). In the event harmful interference occurs or appears likely to occur between two or more LMDS systems and such interference cannot be resolved between the parties, the Commission may require the licensees to make such changes in operations or techniques or equipment as it may deem necessary to avoid such interference.
- (b) Frequency coordination. (1) All licensees in the Local Multipoint Distribution Service shall coordinate proposed frequency usage with existing users in service areas within 75 miles of all base stations affected, and with tentative selectees and other nonmutually exclusive pending applicants whose facilities could affect or be affected by the new proposal in terms of intersystem frequency interference or restricted ultimate system capacity, including shared satellite services operating on the 28.5 29.5 GHz band. This coordination requirement shall also apply to permissive changes (i.e. changes in frequency assignment not requiring prior Commission approval) within an authorized service area.
- (2) All licensees shall cooperate fully and make reasonable efforts to resolve technical problems and conflicts that may inhibit the most effective and efficient use of the radio spectrum; however, the party being coordinated with is not obligated to suggest changes or reengineer a proposal in cases involving conflicts. All licensees shall make every reasonable effort to avoid blocking the growth of other systems that are likely to need additional capacity in the foreseeable future.
- (3) Where technical problems are resolved by an agreement or operating arrangement between the parties that would require special procedures to be taken to reduce the likelihood of inter-system interference or would result in a reduction of quality or capacity of either system, the new licensee shall notify the Commission. Upon making a permissive change, a licensee shall notify the Commission of its frequency usage and report on its coordination as required under this subsection.

# 21.1003 Status election

(a) Applicants and licensees may choose to elect either common carrier or non-common carrier status on a channel-by-channel basis and on an individual cell basis.

- (b) Applicants and licensees must notify the Commission of their status elections and must identify the channels and/or individual cells which are operated on a non-common carrier basis. Areas and channels not on record as being in a non-common carrier status will be presumed to be in common carrier status. Licensees must maintain an accurate record of their status elections with the Commission. Changes in status must be reported within 10 days of the effective date of the change.
- (c) Applicants shall provide a statement in their applications indicating their choices with regard to status.
- (d) Licensees in the LMDS shall follow the procedures set out in \$21.910 for change of status election.

# 21.1004 Content and Form of Applications

- (a) Applications for new LMDS systems, and applications for modification of an LMDS conditional license, must comply with the specifications in this section. Failure by an applicant to comply with any requirement of this section will result in the application being dismissed as defective.
- (b) Forms, pages, and exhibits. Forms, pages and exhibits must be prepared exactly as described and assembled in the order listed in this section.
  - (1) Application cover. The paper original of each application (other than the full-size map) must be enclosed in a stiff cover fastened securely along the left edge. The fastening assembly may not have exposed sharp edges.
  - (2) Transmittal sheet. The first page after the front cover of the application must be the transmittal sheet.
  - (i) Copies of the transmittal sheet may be obtained by contacting the Consumer Assistance Office. Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20554
  - (ii) On the transmittal sheet, the following information is required: the full name of the applicant, the frequency band, and the service area identification name for which the applicant is applying. This information on the transmittal sheet must match exactly the information on the cover of the application.
  - (iii)) The transmittal sheet also contains a certification. The certification must be notarized and signed with the applicant's full name. Applicants must certify to the following:
  - "I hereby certify that this application for an authorization in the Local Multipoint Distribution Service is complete in every respect and contains all of the information required by FCC Form 494 and the Federal Communications Commission's rules governing this service.

"I acknowledge that, if the Commission finds this application to be incomplete and/or not in compliance with its Rules, or finds the certification is incorrect, the Commission will dismiss this application without further consideration

"I certify that I am the real-party-ininterest in this application and there are no agreements or understandings other than those, if any, disclosed in this application, which provide that someone other than the applicant has a direct, indirect, future, or financial interest in the application and/or the requested conditional license. I also certify that the applicant intends to construct and operate the station as proposed and that there are no agreements or understandings inconsistent with this intent.

- "I declare, under penalty of perjury, that I am the authorized representative of the above-named applicant in the matter of this application, that I have read and understood the foregoing certification, and that the matter and things therein stated are true and correct."
- (iv) The certification must be signed and dated in accordance with the requirements of § 1.743 of this chapter. The certification must be signed in reproducible blue or black ink. Mechanical reproductions of the signature must not be used. The name of and position held by the person signing must be typed or clearly and legibly printed beneath the signature.
- (3) Table of Contents. A table of contents must be provided. The table of contents must list all of the exhibits to the application.
- (4) FCC Form 494. All information required for LMDS applications on form 494 must be provided.
- (5) Exhibits. The following exhibits must be set off by tabs and numbered as follows:
  - (i) Exhibit I: Full-size Map. The scale of the full-size map must be 1:25 0,000. The map must show clearly on its face a legend, a distance scale and correctly labelled latitude and longitude lines. The entire map must be clear and legible. The map must show the entire Geographic Service Area and the boundaries of the Basic Trading Area. The map must be folded into a 8 1/2" x 11" plastic pocket that opens at the top or right side, and the pocket must be bound along the left side with the other pages of the application.
  - (ii) Exhibit II: Reduced Map. This map must be a proportional reduction to 8 1/2 x 11 inches, of the full-size maps required for Exhibit I.

- (iii) Exhibit III: Ownership Information. Disclose plans for any arrangements for another entity to manage and/or operate the proposed system and provide the written agreements. if any.
- (iv) Exhibit IV: Service Proposal. Provide information on how the applicant intends to ascertain and provide service to the public.
- (v) Exhibit V: System Design. Engineering and methodology to construct system to carry out service proposal.
- (vi) Exhibit VI: Public Interest Statement.
- (vii) Exhibit VII: Environmental Impact Statement.
- (viii) Exhibit VIII: Business Plan and Start-up Expenses. This exhibit must disclose in detail the projected cost of construction, and other initial expenses of the proposed system, how the applicant intends to go forward with its service proposal and system construction, and how the applicant intends to meet these expenses and cost of operations for the first, year after the entire system is constructed.
- (ix) Exhibit IX: Demonstration of Firm Financial Commitment.

## 21.1005 Areas available for licensing

LMDS applications will be accepted for each of the 487 Basic Trading Areas (BTAs) identified in the Rand McNally 1992 Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide, pp. 38 - 39, plus Alaska and Puerto Rico, for a total 489 Basic Trading Areas (BTAs).

## 21.1006 Application filing period

Applications for an LMDS authorization will not be accepted for any area except upon day(s) specifically identified for acceptance of such applications, as may be announced from time to time by the Commission.

## 21.1007 Geographic Service Areas

- (a) The Geographic Service Area (GSA) of the LMDS system shall be defined by the applicant as the area the applicant intends to serve.
- (b) No GSA may extend beyond the boundaries of the Basic Trading Area for which the applicant is applying. Any application which shows a GSA extending past the BTA boundary will be dismissed as defective.
- (c) (i) The boundaries of the GSA must include 90% of the population of the BTA.
- (c) (ii) The GSA must be drawn on one or more U.S. Geological survey map(s) with a scale of 1:25 0.000. The full-size map and a copy of the map reduced to an 8 1/2" x 11" sheet of paper must be included with the application.
- (c) (iii) The applicant must provide the population of the BTA and provide the calculations showing the percentage of the population it proposes to serve.

#### 21.1008 Settlements

- (a) Applicants in the LMDS must file independent, individual applications.
- (b) Notwithstanding Sections 21.11, 21.23, 21.29, 21.31, 21.38, 21.39, or any other section of this Part, the sale, transfer, assignment or other alienation of any interest in any pending LMDS application is prohibited. This restriction on transfers of interests in LMDS applications includes any form of alienation including option arrangements and agreements, as well as equity and debt placement plans, with the exception of the following:
- (i) involuntary transfers if Sections 21.38(d) and (e) are complied with; and
- (ii) pro forma transfers not involving a change in ownership interest.

# 21.1009 Mutually-exclusive LMDS applications

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections 21.31(b)(2)(i) and (ii), to be entitled to be included in a random selection process with one or more conflicting applications, an application for a LMDS authorization must be received by the Commission in a condition acceptable for filing on the calendar day established by the Commission as the day LMDS applications may be filed for the particular BTA for which the application is filed.

# 21.1010 Interests in LMDS applications

- (a) Interests in applications filed by other than publicly-traded corporations. Except as otherwise provided herein, no party shall have any interest, direct or indirect, in more than one application for any LMDS authorization.
- (b) Interests in publicly-traded corporate applications. No applicant for an LMDS authorization may have an interest, direct or indirect, in any LMDS applications filed by publicly-traded corporations, except that ownership interests of less than one percent will not be considered.

# 21.1011 Demonstration of financial qualifications

- (a) Applicants for an LMDS authorization shall demonstrate a firm financial commitment for the financing necessary to construct its entire proposed system over a period of three years and to operate the system for one year without revenue.
- (b) Applicants must provide a business plan and the realistic and prudent estimated costs of proposed construction and other initial expenses: estimated operating expenses for a period'lof one year after completion of all construction; and for applicants not subject to subparagraph (d) of this section, a balance sheet current within 30 days of the date of the filing of the application.
- (c) The firm financial commitment shall be from a recognized bank or other financial institution and shall evidence the lender's determination that it has assessed the creditworthiness of the loan applicant and that it is committed to providing the necessary financing. The commitment shall state any actions required of the applicant to continue the commitment in force. Applicants obtaining financing from

- other than a recognized lending institution must submit proof that the financing entity has such funds available and uncommitted to another LMDS application.
- (d) Applicants relying on internal financing must provide the following information, current within 90 days of the date of the application, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles:
  - (i) A balance sheet current within 90 days of the date of the application and copies of any financial commitments (for example, loan agreements and service contracts) in support of the proposed facilities; and
  - (ii) Whenever internal financing does not show adequate funds available and committed to meet the reasonable and prudent estimated costs of proposed construction and estimated operating expenses for one year, the applicant shall submit such additional information as is necessary to demonstrate financial ability, such as a current income statement and (from sources other than the proposed LMDS license) a statement of projected revenues and expenses.
  - (iii) The details of any loan or other form of credit arrangement intended to be utilized to finance the proposed construction, acquisition, or operation of the requested facilities including such information as the identity of the creditor(s), letters of commitment, terms of the transaction, and a statement that paragraph (e) of this section is complied with, and the details of any sale or placement of any equity or other form of ownership interest.
- (e) Notice upon default. In addition to the disclosures required by paragraph (d) of this section, any loan or other credit arrangement providing for a chattel mortgage or secured interest in proposed LMDS facility must include a provision for a minimum of ten (10) days prior written notification to "the licensee, and to the Commission, before any such equipment may be repossessed under default provision of the agreement.

## 21.1012 Spectrum utilization

All applicants for LMDS must submit as part of the application a detailed plan indicating how the bandwidth requested will be utilized. In particular the application must contain detailed descriptions of the cellular configuration with polarization diversity, the modulation method, the channel time sharing method, any error detecting and/or correcting codes, any spatial frequency reuse system and the total data throughput capacity in each of the links in the system. Further, the application must include a separate analysis of the spectral efficiency including both information bits per unit bandwidth and the total bits per unit bandwidth.

## 21.1013 Repeaters

The licensee of an LMDS system may install repeaters within its GSA, provided that the power flux density of the signal at any given point along the boundary of the BTA emanating from the repeater is no greater than the predicted power flux density from any LMDS transmitter in the BTA at such point.

## 21.1014 Conditions of licenses

- (a) Each licensee initially will receive a five-year license conditioned upon constructing its authorized system within three years of the date of grant. (Other conditions may also apply to individual licensees as determined by the Commission on a case-by-case basis.) The conditional license will authorize exclusive use of either the A-Band or the B-Band within the borders of one BTA, notwithstanding the area covered by the licensee's proposed Geographic Service Area. The following notifications are required:
  - (i) When all or part of the proposed LMDS system is ready to be placed into operation, the conditional licensee must file a Form 494A, Notification of Completion of Construction, and the relevant fee
  - (ii) Licensees must file a letter notification on or before the three-year anniversary date of the grant of the conditional license certifying that the facilities as authorized have been completed and that the entire'system as approved is now operational and ready to provide service to the public, and will remain operational during the license period, unless the license is submitted for cancellation.
  - (b) No extensions of time to construct will be authorized for any reason, including but not limited to:
  - (i) loss of site availability; and
  - (ii) any pending application for modification of the authorization.
- (c) The provisions of Section 21.44 of this part apply in cases of forfeiture and termination of LMDS station authorizations.

# 21.1015 Assignment, transfer, or alienation of interest in LMDS authorizations

Notwithstanding any other section of this Part, the sale, transfer, assignment or other alienation of any interest in any LMDS conditional license is prohibited prior to completion of all construction authorized by the conditional grant. This restriction on transfers of interests in LMDS conditional licenses includes any form of alienation including option arrangements and agreements, as well as equity and debt placement plans, with the exception of the following.

- (a) involuntary transfers if Sections 21.38(d) and (e) are complied with;
- (b) pro forma transfers involving no change in ownership interest or control of the license.

### 21.1016 License modification

Licensees finding it necessary to change any aspect of their proposal as authorized in the conditional license must file an application to modify their authorization, but this will not relieve the licensee from its obligation to proceed with its construction schedule under the terms of its conditional license.

#### 21.1017 License renewal

LMDS licensees must apply for renewal of their licenses no more than 90 (ninety) and no fewer than 30 (thirty) days before the expiration date of the license. Licensees should comply with the provisions of Section 21.11(c) to renew their licenses.

# APPENDIX C

		\$
Page 1	SERVICE . Area	BEIRE
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	81552503 81552503 81552503 815526019 815526003 8155386003 8155386003 8155386003 8155386003 8155386003 8155386003 8155386003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 815538003 8155927001 815592001 815592001 815592001
Report:	CALL	
1993	PN DATE	05/25/1992 T 05/06/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 05/13/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T
Jan 6,	ACT ION DATE	
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	LA 10/02/1993 AL 01/24/1992 AL 02/20/1992 AL 05/26/1992 AL 05/26/1992 AL 06/20/1992 AL 06/20/1992 AL 07/20/1992 AL 07/06/1992 AL 07/06/1992 AR 06/20/1992 AR 06/12/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/13/1992 AR 06/16/1992 AR 06/1992 AR 06/16/1992 AR 06/28/1992 CA 06/28/1992 CA 06/28/1992 CA 06/28/1992 CA 06/28/1992 CA 06/28/1992 CA 01/24/1992
27 GHZ MICROW	APPLICANT	CELULARVISION  CHELSON, HARY  CHELSON, HARY  CHELSON, HARY  CHELSON, HARY  CHELSON, HARY  CHELSON, ANDREW  ROBERT ROSENKRANZ  P. CENTERNIAL BROADCASTERS  P. CENTERNIAL BROADCASTERS  FORESIGHT COMMUNICATIONS P.  TOMPKINS, W. WOODRUFF  P. TOMPKINS, W. WOODRUFF  FORESIGHT COMMUNICATIONS P.  KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES  P. CHALLES D. SNELLING  P. SANFORD R. ROBERTSON  P. CHARLES D. SNELLING  P. CHARLES D.  SANOCIATED MDS  STEVAN A. BIRNBAUM  SENVISTA GENERAL  P. MADDON  SENVISTA GENERAL  P. SETTER  P. MANDON  SENVISTA GENERAL  P. MANDON  SENVISTA GENERAL  P. MATHLEEN  P. MATHLEEN  P. MATHLEEN  P. MATHLEEN  P. MAHURIN  P. P
	FILE NUMBER	9318609 CELULARV 9218609, 921870 EDELSON, 9211077 GHZ BROAD 9211777 KRZETTOWN 921874 ROBERT RIVERSIGH 921874 CENTENNING 921874 TOWN 921874 TOWN 921874 TOWN 921874 TOWN 9218716 CHARLES IGH 9218176 FREDERICH 9218176 FREDERICH 9218176 CELLULARV 9218175 CELLULARV 9218163 ALDA MULT 9200650 SENVISTA 9218163 ALDA MULT 9200650 BSV PARTN 9700650 BSV PARTN 9200650 ASSOCIATE 921659 ORANGE WINGE WINGE PARTN 9200650 ASSOCIATE 921676 RIVISTA 921676 RIVISTA 921676 SENVISTA SENVISTA 921676 SENVISTA 921676 SENVISTA 921676 SENVISTA 921675 UNICLESS 9218019 PONDEROSA 9218013 CABLE SYS 9218013 CABLE SYS 9218013 CABLE SYS 9218013 CABLE SYS 9210699 BAY BROADGO 9216254 MAHURIN, 189200215 BIRNBAUM A

		55555555555555555555555555555555555555
Je 2	SERVICE AREA	HATCH HATCH HATCH LOS ANGELES LOS ANGELES HODESTO MSA MONTEREY MSA OAKLAND OAK
Page	SERVI	
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155068005 8155068005 8155068005 8155260009 8155219002 8155403005 8155778003 8155778003 8155778003 8155778003 8155778003 8155706010 8155706004 8155706004 8155564001 8155564001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815556001 815508000 815556001 815556001 815508000 815556001 815556001 815508000 815556001 815508000 815508000 815556001 815508000 815508000 815508000 815508000 815508000 815508000000 8155080000000 8155080000000000
Report:	CALL	
1993	PN DATE	02/12/1992 TE 02/12/1992 TE 02/12/1992 TE 08/21/1991 TE 08/05/1992 T 08/118/1992 T 06/10/1992 T 05/06/1992 T
Jan 6, 19	ACT 10N DATE	
INVENTORY	FILE DATE	12/31/1991 12/31/1991 01/03/1992 07/15/1991 08/03/1992 09/29/1992 03/24/1992 03/24/1992 03/24/1992 03/24/1992 01/24/1992
ROWAVE		\$
27 GHZ MICRC	ż	ESS COMM P C. C
	APPLICANT	CITY OF GUSTINE CITY OF GUSTINE CITY OF GUSTINE CELLULARVISION PREFERED WIRELESS COMM CT COMM. CORP. TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS HOVNANIAN, NINA C. TELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR TELECOM/HADOCK TELECOM/HAD
	FILE NUMBER	9210734 CITY 9210733 CITY 9210733 CITY 9218775 CELLU 9218191 PREFE 9218279 CT CC 9218627 TELEC 9216527 TELEC 9216539 TANIS 9216537 TELEC 9216537 TELEC 9216537 TELEC 9216537 TELEC 9216537 TELEC 9218041 SUITE 9218041 SUITE 9218041 SUITE 9218041 SITE 9218041 SUITE 9218041 SITE 9218041 SITE 9218070 MAUR

		######################################
Page 3	SERVICE AREA	S SANTA BARBARA S SANTA BARBARA S SANTA CRUZ S SANTA CRUZ S SANTA MARIA S SANTA ROSA S SANTA ROSA S SANTA ROSA I SEVEN SPRINGS VALLEY S SOLANO CNTY MSA S STOCKTON D WATERBURY HARTFORD HARTFORD HARTFORD HARTFORD HARTFORD WASHINGTON WASHINGTON WILLMINGTON
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155292003 815598006 815598006 815593002 815593002 815592001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 81559001 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003 815590003
Report:	CALL	
1993	PN DATE	06/17/1992 T 02/05/1992 S 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 03/04/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 1 02/12/1992 T 06/10/1992 T 1 06/10/1992 T 1 06/10/1992 T 1 12/11/1991 S 1 12/11/1991 S
Jan 6,	ACT ION DATE	
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	CA 08/26/1992 CA 07/29/1992 CA 05/18/1992 CA 05/18/1992 CA 05/18/1992 CA 04/06/1992 CA 04/06/1992 CA 04/06/1992 CA 04/13/1992 CA 04/13/1992 CA 04/13/1992 CA 05/18/1992 CA 05/11/1992
27 GHz MICR	APPLICANT	9 DUNNE/SANTELL/SINGER P 5 CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP P 5 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 8 GILIO, ROBIN V. P 8 BYSCILLA MARSTON P 8 SUUTE 12 GROUP P 9 SUUTE 12 GROUP P 9 SUUTE 12 GROUP P 9 SUUTE 12 GROUP P 1 TOTAL TV OF CALIFORNIA P 9 SUCHAALD, JOSEPH B. P 1 JORGENSEN, DAVID G. P 1 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 1 JORGENSEN, DAVID G. P 1 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 1 GARISSINI GROUP P 1 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 1 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 1 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 1 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 2 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 2 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 3 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 4 TANIS WIRELESS ENTERPRIS P 5 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 6 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 6 HORNBY, HENRI R. P 6 TOTAL TV
	FILE NUMBER	9218229 9218055 9218065 9218067 9216438 9216637 9218053 9218053 9218053 9218053 9218054 9218054 9218057 9218057 9218057 9218057 9218100 9218174 9218270

		SSS REPRESENTED FOR THE STATE OF THE STATE O
Page 4	SERVICE AREA	HILMINGTON
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155811003 8155818006 8155811008 8155141006 8155020010 8155020010 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 815502001 8155810002 8155810002 8155810002 8155810002 8155810003
Report:	CALL	. •
1993	PN DATE	07/05/1992 T 06/17/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 07/29/1992 T 07/29/1992 T 07/29/1992 T 07/29/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 06/10/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 08/05
Jan 6, 19	ACT ION DATE	
GHZ MICROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	DE 04/06/1992 CT 04/13/1992 DE 04/06/1992 DE 04/06/1992 DE 01/07/1992 DE 07/06/1992 DE 07/16/1992
27 GHZ MICROWAN	ER APPLICANT	7586 CONE, S.E., JR P 750 GOLDBERG, ROSALIE Y. 7518 KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES 759 RICHARD C. WOODBRIDGE 750 STICHARD C. WOODBRIDGE 752 BSV PARTNERS P 752 BSV PARTNERSHIP 753 BSV PARTNERSHIP 754 ACOF, EVEREIT I. JR. 755 ALTERNATIVE BROADCAST 75 ALTERNATIVE BROADCAST 76 SALTER SHIP 77 SHIP SACOLATES 76 SALTER SHIP 76 SALTER SHIP 76 SALTER SHIP 77 SHIP SACOLATES 76 SALTER SHIP 77 SHIP SACOLATES 76 SALTER SHIP 76 SALTER SHIP 77 SHIP SACOLATES 77
	FILE NUMBER	9200586 9211350 9211438 92115499 9218008 9211921 9216534 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216683 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216648 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216683 9216696 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806 9216806

		$egin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Page 5	SERVICE AREA	MIAMI
invent27.ace	FEE	8155963002 8155964007 815534007 815534007 815534008 815534008 815534008 815534008 815534009 815534004 815534004 815534007 815534007 815534007 815534007 8155705001 8155705001 8155996001
Report:	CALL	
1993	PN DATE	07/08/1992 T 01/15/1992 S 1 06/10/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 03/18/1992 T
Jan 6,	ACT ION DATE	
ICROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE	FL 05/11/1992 FL 05/11/1992 FL 05/11/1992 FL 08/07/1992 FL 06/13/1992 FL 05/16/1992
27 GHZ MICRO	FILE NUMBER APPLICANT	9211604 FOUR M MLDS GROUP 9218050 ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P 9218199 VICK, MAURICE M. & CHARL P 9218299 JOSC, S.E., JR. 9218204 MATHES, PHILIP H. 9218209 MONTGOMERY, ROBERT L. 9218209 MONTGOMERY, ROBERT L. 9218209 MONTGOMERY, ROBERT L. 9200633 ACOR, EVERETT T. JR. 9210763 FEINBERG, JUDY 9210765 FOUR M MLDS GROUP 9216667 M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER P 921667 M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER P 921667 M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER P 921667 FOUR M NUSSTMENT CORP P 9216675 FELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR P 9216682 MITCHELL & CO. 9211675 GROUP PS216682 MITCHELL & CO. 9211675 GROUP PS216682 MITCHELL & CO. 9211675 LANDERS, HAROLD S. 111 P 9216682 MITCHELL & CO. 9211675 GORNE, DARNER P 9216673 ACON JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. PS21667 M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER P 9216672 MYERS, FREDERICK M. PS216672 MYERS, FREDERICK M. PS216672 MYERS, FREDERICK M. PS216672 PARTICIA B. MAILANI P 9216672 PARTICIA B. MAILANI P 9216673 ELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR P 9216679 ELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR P 9216670 ELECOM/HA

		77788888888888888888888888888888888888			
				SWG	
9		BEACH BEACH BEACH A SA ISLANDS ISLANDS ISLANDS	PMSA	MSA MSA ENE IN, IL I IN PMSA IN PMSA	N NA NA NOLINE ISL NOLINE- COCK ISLAN
96	SERVICE AREA	EXXXX T COCCU		DES MOINES DES MOINES DES MOINES DES MOINES DES MOINES DES MOINES MSA DES MOINES DES M	CHAMPAIGN CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO MSA CHICAGO MSA CHICAGO MSA CHICAGO PMSA DAVENPORT-MOLINE DAVENPORT-MOLINE DAVENPORT/ROCK ISLAN DUPAGE/COOK CTY PMSA
Page	SERVI	WEST WEST WEST AATHE AUGU AUGU CUMM MARI MARI TINI		DES MOINE DES MOINE DES MOINE DES MOINE DES MOINE DES MOINE CCEUR D'A AURORA-FL AURORA/FL CHAMPAIGN	CHAMPAIGN CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO CHICAGO DAVENPORT DAVENPORT DAVENPORT
, ace	85	23007 22001 22001 22007 22007 22007 22007 22007 22000 20000	24003 36002 36003 26003 26013 37005 20003	77013 33012 34005 34002 35002 55011 75015 77008 37005	37006 50007 50007 50003 50003 77004 77004 72008
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155963007 8155963007 8155252001 815512004 868004006 8155142007 815525001 815525001 815526004 815526004 815526004 815526004 8155301007 8155301007 8155301007 8155301007 8155301007	815584003 8155886002 8155984003 8155996013 8155997012 8155997002 8155983006 8680020003	8155177013 8155704005 8155704005 8155815007 8155950002 8155950003 8155816007 8155816007 8155816007	8680087006 8155260007 8155260007 8155281004 8155285003 868002010 8155168002 8155168002 815517004 8155092008
Report:	CALL				a · *
	2.0				
		μ	ш		
		1992 1992 1993 1994 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995	1992 1992 1994 1992 1992 1		
	PN DATE	10/02/1991	05/06/1992 08/05/1992 12/26/1991 07/15/1992 07/15/1992 02/05/1992	02/05/1992 08/05/1992 08/05/1992 08/05/1992 08/05/1992 02/05/1992	08/21/1991 05/15/1991 02/05/1992 06/24/1992
1993		6 -	00-000		
6,	N E				
Jan	ACT 10N DATE				
ORY	mi in	05/11/1992 08/511/1992 08/51/1992 07/20/1992 07/06/1992 08/10/15/1992 07/17/1991 08/10/1992 04/28/1992 08/31/1992 08/31/1992 08/31/1992 08/31/1992 08/31/1992	03/06/1992 01/01/1993 11/27/1991 05/14/1992 05/18/1993 05/18/1993 05/18/1992 05/14/1992	01/13/1992 03/16/1992 03/16/1992 04/06/1992 09/29/1992 10/23/1992 04/06/1992 01/13/1992 01/13/1992	10/27/1992 07/15/1991 06/12/1992 08/20/1992 09/10/1992 07/16/1992 01/13/1992 04/06/1992 06/05/11991
OWAVE INVENTORY	FILE		03/06 01/07 05/14 05/18 05/18 05/14		
AAVE 1					
MICRO		α α α α α α α α α α α α α α α α α α α			
GHZ MICR		FOUR M MLDS GROUP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS CLASSIC BROADCASTING JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. PEYSER, FREDERICK M. JR GLOBAL TELECOMMUNICATION BUTLER, ELIOT GLENAIRE INC JACOBS, MICHAEL UMDA TELECOM WESTERN SYSTEMS INC WESTERN SYSTEMS INC TROPIC ISLES CABLE TV TROPIC ISLES CABLE TV TROPIC ISLES CABLE TV UMDA TELECOM	FAITH C. AMBY PAUL S. BACHOW HOVNANIAN, PARIS H. FRAYDA B. LINDEMANN FOUR M MLDS GROUP OCEAN PARTNERSHIP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS MAURICE & CHARLOTTE VICK CONE, S.E., JR. BRENNAN, JOHN E.	M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM CORP TELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR TELECOM INVESTMENT CORP PRISCILLA MARSTON CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP P.M.J. SECURITIES INC MAH INC ROCHELLE SILVIA M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM CORP M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM CORP M4H INC SPECCHIO DEVELOPERS	EVANS MICROWAVE, INC. CELLULARVISION PALLISADES BROADCASTING ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD EVANS MICROWAVE, INC. LDH INTERNATIONAL INC. JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. SPECCHIO DEVELOPERS, LTD MAI INC EVANSTON TRANSMISSION CO
27	ANT.	FOUR M MLDS GROUP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNE CLASSIC BROADCASTING JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC PEYSER, FREDERICK M. J GLOBAL TELECOMMUNICATI BUTLER, ELIOT GLENAIRE INC JACOBS, MICHAEL UMDA TELECOM WESTERN SYSTEMS INC	FAITH C. AMBY PAUL S. BACHOW HOVNANIAN, PARIS H. FRAYDA B. LINDEMANN FOUR M MLDS GROUP OCCEN PARTNERSHIP ORANGE WIRELESS PAR MAURICE & CHARLOTTE CONE, S.E., JR. CCONE, S.E., JR. CCOLE, S.L.	M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM COI TELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTI TELECOM INVESTMENT CORI PRISCILLA MARSTON CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP P.M.J. SECURITIES INC SKYLINE ENTRTNMNT NTWOI SALL LIKINS ROCHELLE SILVIA M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM COI MAH INC SPECCHIO DEVELOPERS	EVANS MICROWAVE, INC. CELLULARVISION PALLISADES BROADCASTING ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD EVANS MICROWAVE, INC. LDH INTERNATIONAL INC. JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. SPECCHIO DEVELOPERS, L. M3 ILLINDIS TELECOM COI DAMADIAN, ARAM MAH INC. EVANSTON TRANSMISSION
	APPLICANT	M MLDS GROUP GE WIRELESS P. & C.O. VIC P. SIC BROADCAST ED. CREECOMUN ER, ELIOT AIRE INC BS, MICHAEL TELECOM	AMB, PAN, PAN, PAN, PAN, PAN, PAN, PAN, PAN	NOIS INVE INVE INVE SECUR SECUR ENTR KINS E SIL NOIS	ICROW DES BI DES BI LTICH ICROW CARNT CARNT O DEV NOIS N, AR
	¥	FOUR M MLDS GRO ORANGE WIRELESS M.M. & C.O. VIC CLASSIC BROADCA JOSE D. CRNEY FEYSER, FREDERI GLOBAL TELECOMM BUTLER, ELIOT GLENAIRE INC JACOBS, MICHAEL UMDA TELECOM UMDA TELECOM	FAITH C. AMBY PAUL S. BACHOW HOVNANIAN, PARIS FRAYDA B. LINDEM FOUR M MLDS GROU OCEAN PARTNERSHI ORANGE WIRELESS ORANGE WIRELE	M3 ILLINOIS TELEC TELECOM/HADDOCK II TELECOM INVESTMEN PRISCILLA MARSTON CT COMMUNICATIONS CT COMMUNICATIONS P.M.J. SECURITIES MAH INC ROCHELLE SILVIA MAH INC MAH INC SPECCHIO DEVELOPE	EVANS MICROMAVI CELLULARVISION ALDA MULTICHANI EVANS MICROMAVI LDH INTERNATIOI JOS. D. CARNEY SPECCHIO DEVELI M3 ILLINOIS TEI MAH INC EVANSTON TRANSI
	<b>e</b>				
	FILE NUMBER	9211559 9218040 9218201 9218185 9218177 92182178 92180177 9218018 9218018 9218237 9218237 9218238 9218238 9218238	9200366 9200745 9210458 9211678 9211685 9218069 9218072 9218178 9218178	9215510 9216625 9216681 9218260 9218034 9218034 9218267 92180303	9318522 9112773 9218093 9218230 9218240 9218297 9211750 9211376 92113268

		RAFEAFAFAFA A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	W.
Page 7	SERVICE AREA	JULIET PWSA JULIET IL PMSA LAKE COUNTY PWSA ROCKFORD MSA ROCKFORD MSA ROCKFORD MSA ROCKFORD MSA ROCKFORD MSA INDIANAPOLIS INDIANAPOL	*
invent27.ace	FEE SE NUMBER A	815560006 JOLIET 868001001 JOLIET 868001001 JOLIET 868001001 JOLIET 815560006 JOLIET 815560006 JOLIET 815560006 JOLIET 815501001 JOLIET 815501001 JOLIET 815501001 JOLIET 815501001 PEORIA 815501001 PEORIA 815502001 JINDIANAR 8155043001 JINDIANAR 8155043001 JINDIANAR 8155040007 JINDIANAR 815504001 JINDIANAR 815504014 BATON ROB 815504014 BATON ROB 815504001 NEW ORLE 815504001 NEW ORLE 815504001 NEW ORLE 815504001	8155875008 BOSTON
Report: i	CALL SIGN		~
1993	PN DATE	05/13/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T	01/15/1992 s
Jan 6,	ACT ION DATE		
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	11. 03/16/1992 11. 04/06/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/12/1992 11. 05/12/1992 11. 05/12/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/04/1992 11. 05/12/1992 11. 05/12/1992 11. 05/12/1992 12. 05/12/1992 13. 05/12/1992 13. 05/12/1992 14. 05/12/1992 15. 05/12/1992 16. 05/12/1992 17. 05/12/1992 18. 05/12/1992 18. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 19. 05/12/1992 10. 05/12/1992 10. 05/12/1992 11. 05/11/1992 12. 05/11/1992 13. 05/12/1992 14. 05/11/1992 14. 05/11/1992 15. 05/12/1992 16. 05/12/1992	4A 11/25/1991
			۵.
27 GHz MI	APPLICANT	GHZ BROADCASTING INC PAUL LIKINS BSV PARTNERSHIP M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM C MAH INC SANFORD R. ROBERTSON ILCHCA CORP. ILCHCA CORP. ALTERNATIVE BROADCASTIN RONALD E. SANSAC M3 ILLINOIS TELECOM C MAH INC SMITH, WILLIAM L. ALTERNATIVE BROADCAST FAUL LIKINS CCT COMM. CORP. BMB PARTNERSHIP BACHOW, PAUL S. CORNBLATT, ARNOLD HORNBY, HAROLD AMBY, FAITH C. AMBY, FAITH C. PATRICIA MILANA TELECOM/HADDOCK INVES ORANGE WIRELESS PRECER ASSOCIATES N.J. SECURITIES INC OLOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOCIATES ON J. SECURITIES INC OLOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOCIATES N.J. & C.O. VICK PARTI PATRICIA MILANA TELECOM/HADDOCK INVES STREDER LTD ST	WIRELESS CABLE LTD
	FILE NUMBER	850 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	4 125c124

		MAN	ž ž
Page 8	SERVICE AREA	MSA  R BOSTC CE PMSA CE-HAVE CE-HAVE DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD DFORD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIER MSA TER TER MSA TER	MINN/ST. PAUL MSA MINN/ST. PAUL MSA
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155705018 8 815508004 8 8680003009 8 8155414101	8155234008 MI 8155386008 MI
Report:	CALL SIGN		
	PN DATE	08/05/1992 C 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 07/08/1992 T 07/08/1992 T 07/08/1992 T 07/08/1992 T 05/05/1992 T	02/12/1992 s 05/13/1992 s
Jan 6, 1993	ACT I ON DATE		
CROWAVE INVENTORY	F1LE DATE		MN 02/11/1992
27 GHZ MI	APPLICANT	SEAVIEW TELESYSTEMS ALDA MULTICHANNELS, JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. PRISCILLA MARSTON WESTERN SIERRA LLAWEENCE FRAIBERG CT COMM. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS CELULARVISION CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP TOWN MLDS GROUP CONNECTICUT HOME THEATER CACNE, JR. CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. BRUCE BOSSARD LINDEMANN FAYDA B. JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. ACOR, EVERETT T. JR. ORNG. WIRE PART. CELULARVISION MARK SILBERMAN MARK SILBERMAN MARK SILBERMAN JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. HIGH BAND BRDSC. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. CT COMM. CORP. ALTN MARK SILBERMAN MARK SILBERMAN JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. HIGH BAND BRDSC. CORP.	K&K IELECCMMUNICATION P DR. KIM SLOAN P
	FILE NUMBER		9215867

		<u> </u>	2222E
0 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	SERVICE AREA		RALEIGH/DURHAM RALEIGH/DURHAM RALEIGH/DURHAM BISMARCK WILLISTON OMAHA OMAHA
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155386008 8155410005 8155612005 8155612005 8155612005 8155638001 8155638006 8155640001 8155640001 8155960014 8155560113	8155876005 8155701012 8155733001 8155138001 8155815005 8155815005 8155816005
Report:	CALL		
1993	PN DATE	05/13/1992 s 06/24/1992 T 01/15/1992 T 01/15/1992 T 08/05/1992 S 08/05/1992 T 05/15/1992 T 05/15/1992 T 05/15/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 01/29/1992 T 01/29/1992 C 08/05/1992 C 08/05/1992 C 08/05/1992 C 08/05/1992 T 01/29/1992 T	02/19/1992 T 07/08/1992 T 08/05/1992 T T 06/03/1992 T
Jan 6,	ACT 10N DATE		
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	MN 02/11/1992 MN 03/16/1992 MN 12/05/1991 MN 12/05/1991 MN 03/16/1992 MO 02/06/1992 MO 05/15/1991 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MO 05/16/1992 MC 05/12/1992 MC 05/15/1992 MC 05/15/1992	04/05/1 04/06/1 05/06/1 04/06/1 04/06/1
CROWA			:22 2222
27 GHZ MI	APPLICANT	DR. KIM SLOAN JORN S. BACHOW JOHN E. BRENNAN LINDEMANN, FRAYDA B. BRYANNET BRYANNET ANDREW ASTINSKI LDH INTERNATIONAL INC ANDREW WAHL ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD HOVNANIAN, ARMEN BACHOW, PAUL S. FOUR M MLDS GROUP WIRELESS PARTNERS BACHOW, PAUL S. FOUR M HLDS GROUP WIRELESS PARTNERS S.E. CONE, JR. CELULARVISION R&R TELECOMMUNICATION R&R TELECOMMUNICATION R&R TELECOMMUNICATION R&R TELECOMMUNICATION RAR TELECOMMUNICATION RAR TELECOMMUNICATION RAR TELECOMMUNICATION RAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS FOUR ENTERPRISES, INC. JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS FOUR ENTERPRISES, INC. JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS FOUR ENTERPRISES, INC. JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS FOUR MLDS GROUP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS FOUR ENTERPRISES INC TELECOM, HARRY ANDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS FOUR MLDS GROUP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS FOUR MLDS GROUP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS FOUR MLDS GROUP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS FOUR MAILANI BSY PARTNERSHIP BSY PARTNERSHIP BSY PARTNERSHIP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS HAYES, THOMAS CONE ENTERPRISES FOUR MAILANI BSY PARTNERSHIP FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS FULLOW FRANDA B. FRANDA BSS FRANDA B. FM STARRERSHIP	LD
	FILE NUMBER	9215867 9200419 9200425 9200425 9210590 9211015 9211015 9211617 9211617 921617 9216184 9211716 9211716 9211716 9211716 9211716 9211557 9211619 9211557 9211634 9211557 9211634 9211557 9211634 9211557 9211634 9211557 9211634	

			<b>₹</b> ≩≩
Page 10	SERVICE AREA	OMAHA OMAHA OMAHA OMAHA OMAHA OMAHA OMAHA ATLANTIC CITY BERGEN-PASSAIC BERGEN-PASSAIC JERSEY CITY MANA LONG BEACH ALDDLESEX-SOMERSET MONMOUTH-OCEAN MONMOUTH	SANTA FE CARSON CITY LAS VEGAS
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER		
Report:	CALL		
1993	PN DATE	02/05/1992 S 02/05/1992 T 02/19/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 05/06/1992 T 05/06/1992 T 05/06/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 05/20/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 T	T T 06/24/1992 T
Jan 6, 1	ACT ION DATE		
OWAVE INVENTORY	FILE		
GHZ MICROWA			<u> </u>
27 GHz	APPLICANT	WIRELESS SANFORD DIANE WE SANFORD MA A H IN ORION BRA MAH INC CELLULAR KRZETTOM KRZETOM KRZETO	PERRY MICHAE BRENN
	FILE NUMBER	9215431 9215434 9218032 9218032 9218032 9218032 9211633 9211633 9211633 9211024 9211025 9211025 9211025 9211025 9211025 9211018 9211018 9211018 9211025 9210029 9210029 9210029 9210029 9210029 9210029 9210029 9211631 9211621 9211621 9211621	9218180 9218217 9200428

		_	
=	띮	EGAS EGAS EGAS EGAS EGAS EGAS EGAS EGAS	,
Page	SERVICE AREA	LAS VEGAS LAS VEGAS LAS VEGAS LAS VEGAS LAS VEGAS LAS VEGAS MSA RENO RENO RENO RENO RENO ALBANY BUFALO BUFFALO BUFFAL	ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER
7.ace	æ		-
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155611005 8155611005 8155088003 8155154003 815525004 815525004 815526011 8155840007 8155840007 8155960000 8155960000 81559600000000000000000000000000000000000	8155970003 8155609008 8155609008
Report:	CALL		
			1992 T 1992 T 1992 T
м	PN	05/13/1992 01/15/1992 03/18/1992 05/10/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 07/08/1992 06/10/1992	08/05/1992 05/13/1992 05/13/1992
6, 1993	<del></del>		
Jan (	ACT 10N DATE		
TORY	<b>4</b> E	03/18/1992 11/25/1991 06/17/1992 01/24/1992 01/24/1992 02/20/1992 02/20/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 04/06/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/06/1992 06/16/1992 06/16/1992 06/20/1992	1992 1992 1992
INVENTORY	FILE	V 03/18/1999 V 05/11/1999 V 06/17/1999 V 06/17/1999 V 07/10/1999 V 07/10/1999 V 07/10/1999 V 07/10/1999 V 07/10/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 04/07/1999 V 06/04/1999 V 06/04/1999	05/12/1992 03/17/1992 03/17/1992
GHZ MICROWAVE		- テロテララニニニニニニニニニニニニニニニートトトトトトトトトトトレートレートレートレー・・・・・・・・	ž ž ž
MICR		$\begin{array}{c} a \land a $	
27 GHz		S LTD	တ္ တ
8	ANT	NANNEL: S. S. MANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNEL: ANNE. A	S. SOCIATE SOCIATE
٠	APPL I CANT	MULTICHANNELS MULTICHANNELS MULTICHANNELS MULTICHANNELS MULTICHANNELS MULTICHANNELS IT E. LA BLANC IT E. LA BLANC IN A COMMUNICA MY, HAROLD IN, JOHNATHAN IN A COMMUNICAT ELECOMMUNICAT ELECOMMUNICAT ELECOMMUNICAT ELECOMMUNICAT EN MICROMAVE, A CORP IN MICROMAVE, A CORP IN MICROMAVE, A CORP IN MICROMAVE, IN MICROMANE, IN SIERRA A SIERRA A MICROMAVE, AN SIERRA A MICROMAVE, AN MICROMAVE, AN MICROMAVE, AN MICROMAVE,	AUL S ASSC ASSC
		D BACHOW, PAUL S.  O SUITE 12 GROUP  ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD  ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD  F ALDA MULTICHANNELS LTD  S ROBERT E. LA BLANC  S ROBERT E. LA BLANC  S ROBERT E. LA BLANC  VIRGINIA COMMUNICATIONS  WERNBY, HAROLD  HORNBY, HAROLD  HORNBY, HAROLD  FRIEND, JOHNATHAN E.  SASOCIATED MOS CORP.  BACHOW, PAUL S.  CONE, S.E., JR  KINGSHOOD ASSOCIATES  HORNBY, HENRI R.  RUSSELL HEDDEN  ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS  RRR TELECOMMUNICATION  RASSOCIATED MOS CORP.  BACHOW, PAUL S.  BOSSARD, MARK  KINGSHOOD ASSOCIATES  EASTERN MICROWAVE, INC.  ILOHCA CORP  BACHOW, PAUL S.  BOSSARD, MARK  KINGSHOOD ASSOCIATES  EASTERN MICROWAVE, INC.  ILOHCA COMMUNICATIONS  HORNBY, HENRI R.  ROBERT E. LA BLANC  CELLTEL COMMUNICATIONS  HYE CREST MANAGEMENT  JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC.  WIAGRA PARTNERS  NIAGRA PARTNERS  NASCCIATED MOS CORP.  ASSOCIATED MOS CORP.  ASSOCIATED MOS CORP.	BACHOW, PAUL S. KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES
		COFF ***********************************	
	FILE NUMBER	9211190 9215350 9215350 92154525 9215625 9215625 9210657 9211132 9200550 9211135 9211346 9211346 9211346 9211346 9211347 9211539 9211605 9211605 9211605 9211619 9211619 9211619 9211619 9211619 9211618 9211619 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 9211618 921618 921618 921618 921618 921618 921618 921618	9200723 9211180 9211180

			*********	5 5 5 5	******	**********	**************************************
e Page 12	SERVICE AREA	ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER ROCHESTER	NUCLESIER PRISA SYRACUSE SYRACUSE SYRACUSE SYRACUSE SYRACUSE SYRACUSE SYRACUSE UTICA-ROME	AKRON AKRON AKRON		CAN ION MSA CANTON MSA CINCINNATTI CINCINNATTI CINCINNATI CINCINNATI CINCINNATI	CLEVELAND COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS COLUMBUS
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155963005 8155008001 8155003016 8155703016 8155962003 8155082005 815505005 815505005	815545013 815545013 815595004 8155091002 8155703019 815570014 8155378001 8155048001	8155982010 8155357003 8680002001	815525010 815525010 815525010 8155142002 8155098005 8155121003	81559903 8680004008 8155982009 8155996005 8155996015 8155997015 8155997007 8680002005	8155346003 815595009 8155995009 8155995011 8155997013 815597009 8480002002 8155811013 8155811013 8155811013 8155811013
Report:	CALL						
1993	PN DATE	T 07/15/1992 T T T T T	05/06/1992 T 07/08/1992 T T T T T T	07/08/1992 T T T	03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T T 07/29/1992 T	08/05/1992 T 07/07/1908 T 10/16/1991 TE 07/15/1992 T 03/18/1992 T T	09/25/1991 TE 07/15/1992 T 07/15/1992 T 03/18/1992 T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T
Jan 6,	ACT 10N DATE						
27 GHZ MICROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE DATE	NY 05/11/1992 NY 05/20/1992 NY 05/12/1992 NY 05/12/1992 NY 05/11/1992 NY 05/27/1992 NY 10/16/1992		OH 05/14/1992 OH 09/16/1992 OH 10/02/1992 OH 10/15/1992		OH 03/16/1992 OH 10/02/1992 OH 09/11/1991 OH 05/18/1992 OH 05/18/1992 OH 05/18/1992 OH 05/18/1992 OH 05/18/1992 OH 10/02/1992	
27 GHZ MICRC	FILE APPLICANT APPLICANT	9211601 FOUR M MLDS GROUP 9211712 EASTERN MICROMAVE, INC. P 9211826 HASCOE, NORMAN 9216642 SCNY COMMUNICATIONS INC P 9218043 ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P 9218145 S.E. CONE, JR. P 9218153 ALTERNATIVE BROADCAST NT P 9218313 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. P 9318621 CELULARVISION		9211616 ILOHCA CORP 9218243 RICHARD CARL LEVY PART P 9318288 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. P 9318513 ROY, SHIELA ANN P	R&R TELECOMMUNICATION R&R TELECOMMUNICATION CHARLES D. SNELLING HIGH BAND BROADCASTING MARK SILBERMAN CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP		EVANSTON TRANSMISSION CO ANDREW J. KRZETTOWSKI FOUR M MLDS GROUP PRINCETON SCIENTIFIC MARK K. SHAH MARK K. SHAH ORAUREE & CHARLOTTE VICK ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS S.E. CONE, JR. JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. ASSCIATED MDS CORP. BACHOW, PAUL S. PAUL LIKINS BACHOW, PAUL S. FAUL LIKINS BACHOW, PAUL S. FAUL LIKINS BACHOW, PAUL S. FAUL LIKINS BACHOW, PAUL S. FAUL LIKINS BACHOW, PAUL S. SAVPHILL GROUP

			₹ 8	5 8	ē ē	ੱ <b>ਨ</b>	픙	8	8	8	5	3	8	5	픙	픙	중	<b>#</b>	픙	₹	중 8	5 8	5 8	5 8	š	¥	ᇂ	충	8	8	¥ 8	<b>5</b>	š	8	충	¥ ;	<b>š</b> è	ś ĕ	8	ᇂ	8	¥ :	<b>š</b> 8	š 8	š 8	<b>5 8</b>	ĕ	8	క	క	ğ	2
Page 13	SERVICE AREA		COLUMBUS	COLUMBUS MSA	DAYTON	DAYTON	DAYTON	DAYTON MSA				HAMILTON	HAMILTON		LIMA				TOLEDO		TOLEDO MSA	VOUNDS TOWN		2000	OKLAHOMA CITY	OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA CITY	OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA CITY	OKI AHOMA	OKLAHOMA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA	TULSA PMSA	EUGENE	EUGENE MSA	PORTLAND POPTI AND	PORTLAND		PROTLAND		SALEM	SALEM	
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER		,0000,1110	815594003	8155705011	8155703005	8155704009	8155254004	8155254004	8680002008	8680011002	8155098003	8155025008	8155481004	8155082008	8155177001	8155481005	8155082013	8680003004	8155405004	8155142004	9455424006	8680003007	8155962019	8155254013	8155970007	8155963013	8155058002	8155856004	8155962013	8155075010	8155354012	8680011009	8155968003	8155456014	8155963011	8155856002	8155065005	8155075008	8155964011	8155379003	8680052003	8155257008	8133436003	8155187006	10000	8155939002	8155254006	8155254006	8155609002	8155121004	
Report:	CALL	<b>;</b>																																																		
1993	PN DATE		02/12/1992 T	01/15/1992 TE		08/05/1992 C	08/05/1992 T	03/18/1992 T	03/18/1992 T	<b> </b>	-	07/29/1992 1	<b>+</b> -	05/13/1992 T	-	08/05/1992 T	05/13/1992 T	<b>)-</b>	<b>j</b> — (	05/20/1992 I	T 42/1003 T	1 2661 /61 /60	<b>\$</b>	- \$	04/08/1992 1	<b>5</b>	-	•	08/05/1992 T	<b>! 1</b>	\$-	<b>-  </b> -	- 1	-	05/06/1992 T	L 66677 L67 66	1 2661/50/80	-	· •	<b></b>	<b>5</b> (	) I	- + 6001/01/20	06/10/1992 1	04/06/1992 1 02/10/1002 T	02/05/1992 s		03/18/1992 T	03/18/1992 T	05/13/1992 T	-	•
Jan 6, 1	ACT ION DATE																																																			
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE		01/21/1992	12/10/1991	03/16/1992	03/24/1992	03/16/1992	01/24/1992	01/24/1992	10/02/1992	10/02/1992	06/23/1992	05/27/1992	02/26/1992	06/16/1992	07/20/1992	02/26/1992	06/17/1992	10/02/1992		06/06/1992	02/11/17/2	10/01/1992	05/12/1992	01/24/1992	05/12/1992	05/11/1992	06/08/1992	04/08/1992	05/12/1992	06/12/1992	09/11/1992	10/02/1992	05/12/1992	02/24/1992	05/11/1992	04/08/1992	06/09/1992	06/12/1992	05/11/1992	09/22/1992	10/16/1992	08/10/1992	02/20/1992	01/24/1992	01/13/1992	05/04/1992	01/24/1992	01/24/1992	03/17/1992	06/30/1992	
ROWAVE		;	5 3	5 5	동	픙	중	픙	동	동	중	중	중	픙	픙	픙	₹	₹ ;	₹:	₹ ?	5 8	5 2	5 8	ă	ð	충	ᆼ	ğ	8	¥ ;	<b>5</b> 8	<b>5</b>	š	Š	ᆼ	8	¥ 9	ś 8	8	ᆼ	ᆼ	¥ (	<b>5</b> 8	šŧ	š 8			క	క	క	Š	2
27 GHZ MICH	APPLICANT		DIANE WECHSLER	DAYTON WIRELESS	P.M.J. SECURITIES INC		TELECOM INVESTMENT CORP	R&R TELECOMMUNICATION	RER TELECOMMUNICATION P	Y & ASSC.	CELULARVISION P	HIGH BAND BROADCASTING	ALTERNATIVE BROADCAST NT		PMB PARTNERSHIP	MARK J. KONRAD P		PMB PARTNERSHIP	JOS. D. CAREY & ASSC. P		CHARLES D. SNELLING P			ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P							KOBERISON, SANFOKU K. P	DICHADO CADI I EVY DADT D	CELULARVISION P			FOUR M MLDS GROUP P	SENVISIA GENERAL P	MEEKER HERRERT S. P	ROBERTSON, SANFORD R. P	CONE, S.E., JR. P	RICHARD CARL LEVY PART P	CELULARVISION	TAGGARI, KOBERI B.	SUBSCRIBER IV PARINERS P	CARBKIDGE MANAGEMEN! F					FM VIDEO BROADCASTERS P	SILBERMAN, MARK P	
	FILE NUMBER		9215546	9210598	9216605	9216614	9216631	9215617	9215617	9318295	9318611	9211861	9218156	9215893	9218103	9211947	9215892	9218110	9518501	9215935	9218175	0218112	0318304	9218049	9200209				9216669		2018126						7216677		_							9215515					9218114	

		8	<b>8</b> 8 8	Z Z	<b>8</b> 8	Z o	£ & 2	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b> 8	Z a	<b>E E</b>	₹ 8	<b>S S</b>	A Q	<b>.</b> &	<u> </u>	Z Z	<b>Z</b> 8	Z	<b>&amp;</b> &	<b>Z Z</b>	<u> </u>	Æ	A A	¥.	<b>A</b> 4		<b>X</b> 8	<b>5</b>	æ a	<b>5</b>	æ 8	£	₩.	222
Page 14	SERVICE AREA	ALLENTOWN ALLENTOWN ALLENTOWN	ALLENTOWN ALLENTOWN PMSA	HARRISBURG	HARRISBURG Harrisburg	HARRISBURG Harrisbirg		HARRISBURG/LEBANON	LANCASTER LANCASTER	PHILADELPHIA	PHILADELPHIA MSA	PITSBURGH	PITTSBURG	PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH	PITTSBURGH	PITTSBURGH PITTSBURGH	PITTSBURGH	PITISBURGH		PITTSBURGH PMSA PITTSBURGH PMSA		PITTSBURGH PMSA RANSOM PMSA	READING	READING SCRANTON	SCRANTON	SCRANTON MSA	È	YORK	ORK	YORK	YORK	SAN JUAN	PANTUCKET - WOONSOCKET	PROVIDENCE DDOVIDENCE	PROVIDENCE PROVIDENCE
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155963010 8155962018 8155964017	8155224005 8680020008 8155065003	8155968005	8155177009	8155962008	8155816006	8155939008	8680064002	8155674008	8680004005	8155435002	8155996012	8155940013 8155982008		8155996006		2007886618		8155255011		8680020005						8155969003		8155962006 1				8155430010 P	
Report:	CALL																												i						
					- w		<b></b>	· } }		<u> </u>	٠	_ #	<b>⊢</b> ¦	<b>≝ -</b> -	· • •	- <b>-</b> -	<b>-</b> -	- +	<b>-</b> 1		<b>-</b> •	}	<b>-</b> 1	- +-	<b>-</b> - }	<u> </u>	<b>.</b>	<b></b>	- <b> -</b>	<b>-</b>	- 1 1		- <b>-</b> - i	<b>.</b>	
1993	PN DATE				02/05/1992		08/05/1992		1	05/15/1991		10/09/1991		2661/51/10					03 148 14000	03/18/1992	05/13/1992				06/24/1992	08/05/1992			08/05/1992	•		•		10/06/1661	06/03/1992
Jan 6, 1	ACT TON DATE																																		
27 GHZ MICROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE		PA 10/06/1992 PA 10/06/1992 PA 06/09/1992					PA 05/04/1992		MA 02/08/1991 PA 07/15/1991	_		PA 05/18/1992			05/15/1	PA 05/14/1992 PA 05/18/1002	10/23/1	-		PA 02/26/1992	-	PA 08/07/1992		PA 04/06/1992			PA 05/11/1992 PA 05/11/1992	PA 03/13/1992	PA 05/12/1992	-		09/29/1	RI 05/14/1992	
27 GHz MICRO	FILE NUMBER APPLICANT	9211556 FOUR M MLDS GROUP 9218044 ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P 9218136 CONE, S.E., JR.		BACHOW, PAUL S.		9218151 CONE, S.E., JR. PAKINEKS P. 9218151 CONE, S.E., JR.	9216677 RONALD E. SANSAC P 9318628 BSV PARTNERSHIP P	9218035 MAH INC 0318504 MATHES BHILLD H B	LIKINS, PAUL		ASSOC.	HARATUNIAN, MICHAEL	9218066 ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P	ILOHCA CORP.		ASSOCIATED MDS CORPO	9218131 BRENNAN, JOHN E. P 9218137 CONF. S.F IR. D	ASSOCIATED MDS CORP	9318296 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSC. P	R&R TELECOMMUNICATION	9215889 VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS P		9218205 METTLER COMMUNICATIONS P	AMBY, FAITH C.	Ę	9216587 PATRICIA B. MAILANI P	SNELLING, CHARLES D.		SENVISTA GENERAL		TOMPKINS, W. WOODRUFF	FREEDOM LECHNOLOGIES SMC ASSOCIATES	CT COMMUNICATIONS CORP	9116121 ALLIANCE ASSOCIATES P 9200743 BACHOW. PAUL S.	LD GROUP

		22222	X	ខ្លួនខ្លួនខ្លួ	SC S	**********	************
invent27.ace Page 15	SERVICE 3ER AREA	PROVIDENCE 8155705005 PROVIDENCE 8155703013 PROVIDENCE 8155704002 PROVIDENCE 8155997001 PROVIDENCE	=	81554002 CHARLESTON 8155405005 CHARLESTON MSA 8155703020 COLUMBIA 815527007 COLUMBIA 8155456007 COLUMBIA MSA		8155456016 KNOXVILLE 8155963017 KNOXVILLE 8155962010 KNOXVILLE 8155075002 KNOXVILLE 8155141001 KNOXVILLE 815504002 KNOXVILLE 8155379004 KNOXVILLE 8680009004 KNOXVILLE 8680009004 KNOXVILLE 8680009004 KNOXVILLE 815577004 KNOXVILLE 815577004 KNOXVILLE	MEMPHI MEMPHI MEMPHI MEMPHI MEMPHI MEMPHI MASHVI NASHVI NASHVI NASHVI NASHVI NASHVI NASHVI
vent	FEE Number	81557 81557 81557 81557	8 1552 8 1552 8 1554 8 1554 1557	81554 81554 81557 81557 81554	81550 81550 81550 81550 86800 86800 86800 86800	81554 81559 81559 81559 81559 81553	201500 81550 81550 81550 81550 81550 81550
Report: in	CALL						
1993	PN DATE	02/05/1992 s 08/05/1992 C 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T	03/18/1992 T 03/18/1992 T 06/10/1992 T 06/24/1992 T	05/20/1992 T T T T 06/10/1992 T	03/25/1992 1 05/13/1992 1 1 05/13/1992 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		02/12/1992 TE T T T 04/29/1992 T T T 01/15/1992 TE T T T 01/15/1992 TE T T 02/05/1992 TE T 02/05/1992 TE T T 02/05/1992 TE T T T 02/05/1992 TE T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T
Jan 6,	ACT I ON DATE						
INVENTORY	FILE DATE	KY 12/09/1991 RI 03/16/1992 RI 03/24/1992 RI 03/16/1992 RI 05/18/1992 RI 05/18/1992		SC 02/13/1992 SC 03/16/1992 SC 06/12/1992 SC 08/10/1992 SC 02/20/1992	SC 11/24/1992 SC 01/24/1992 SC 02/26/1992 SC 03/16/1992 SC 06/16/1992 TN 10/15/1992 TN 10/15/1992 TN 10/02/1992 TN 10/02/1992	N 02/24/1992 N 05/11/1992 N 05/12/1992 N 05/12/1992 N 05/11/1992 N 05/22/1992 N 05/12/1992	-0000000000
OWAVE		X & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &	< ~ ~ w w w w w			XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	
27 GHz MICROWAVE INVENTORY	R APPLICANT	WIRELESS CABLE LTD P.M.J. SECURITIES INC TELECOM/HADDOCK INVESTOR TELECOM INVESTMENT CORP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS CONE. S.E. JR.	19 R&R TELECOMUNICATION P 19 R&R TELECOMUNICATION P 99 SUBSCRIBER TV PARTNERS P 20 KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES P 42 FORESIGHT COMMUNICATIONS P 45 SCNY COMMUNICATIONS P 54 SCNY COMMUNICATIONS P 54 SCNY COMMUNICATIONS P 54 SCNY COMMUNICATIONS P	ROBERT ROSENKRANZ SCNY COMMUNICATIONS ROBERTSON, JEANNE P. BSV PARTNERSHIP SUBSCRIBER TV PARTNERS CELLII ARVISTON	EDELSON, HARRY KRZETTOWSKI, ANDREW J. SENVISTA GENERAL SCNY COMMUNICATIONS MITCHELL, DAVID JAN CELULARVISION BUTLER, LAWRENCE KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES BUTLER, MICHAEL CELULARVISION CELULARVISION BACHOW, PAUL S.	GHZ BROADCASTING INC FOUR MILDS GROUP ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS OROBERTSON, JEANNE P. ECONE, S.E., JR. ALDA MULTICHANNELS, LTD RICHARD CARL LEVY PART CELULARVISION BACHOW, PAUL S. BROWN, DAVID	22 CORNBLATT, ARNOLD P 29 HIGH BAND GROUP P 29 HIGH BAND BROADCASTING P 29 HIGH BAND BROADCASTING P 29 HIGH BAND BROADCASTING P 25 CONE, S.E., JR. P 27 ASSOCIATED MDS CORP P 27 ASSOCIATED MDS CORP P 28 ASSOCIATED MDS CORP P 38 CONE, S.E., JR. P 39 CONE, S.E., JR. P 40 LEVIN, MICHAEL H. P 41 R&R TELECOMMUNICATION P
	FILE NUMBER	9215436 9216601 9216621 9216640 9218076	9215619 9215619 9215999 9211420 9211942	9215936 9216643 9218096 9218189 9216119	9210967 9211718 9215891 9218104 9318618 9318519 9318619 9318610 9318610	9211076 9211549 9218055 9218121 9218152 9218245 9218245 9210267	9210732 9211600 9211829 9218075 9218144 9218320 9210357 9200551 9210576 9211310

			Z	Z Z	<u> </u>	<b>*</b>	×	ĭ	ĭ	ĭ	<u></u>	×	×:	<u> </u>	<u>×</u> }	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	×	×	¥	ĭ	ĭ	ĭ	ĭ	×	<b>≃</b> ;	<u>×</u> }	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	×	¥	¥	¥	ž i	<u>×</u> ?	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	×	×	×:	×	<u> </u>	≤ <u>≃</u>	×	×	×	ĭ.	≚≱	<u> </u>	×	¥
																							I PMSA		į	MORIH																							NO.			
16	30,		<u>۳</u> :	<u> </u>	ł		o.	o,											<u></u>	T PMSA	TLLE	LE	CHRIST				_					MSA			<b>=</b> :	<b>E</b> 3	c 3:	: ==	Ŧ	×	Ĕi		YOU NO						N MTC			
Page	SERVICE AREA		NASHVILLE	NASHVILLE	ABILENE	ABILENE	<b>AMARILLO</b>	AMAR ILLO	AUSTIN	AUSTIN	AUSTIN	AUSTIN	AUSTIN	AUSITA	ALICIA	ALISTA	AUSTIN	AUSTIN	BEAUMONT	BEAUMONT	BROWNSVILLE	BROWNVILLE	CORPUS CHRISTI	DALLAS	DALLAS	_	EL PASO								FT WORTH	T WOK I	ET CORTH		T WORTH	T WORTH	T. WORTH	FI. WORTH	HOLISTON	HOUSTON	HOUSTON	LAREDO	LAREDO	LAREDO	LUBBUCK MCA! EDIN MISSN	MCALLEN	MCALLEN	MIDLAND
7.ace	8		- 00	25004	56003 /			00002	78006 /	36005	88006 /	, 10010	20008	78002	2000	55881007 A												7005	2003	7007	11005 E	4003 E	4003 E	1010		2004			u.	1012 F	9009 1					1008 L	7001	4004 L	3007 E			
invent27.ace	FEE Number		01110	8155055004	81554	81553	81551	86800	81558	81558	81558	81551	8122068008	מת הוא	2177	8155	81558	8155886004	8155224003	8680009010	8155868003		8680009009	,000	8680006001	015556000	8155027002	815587	815588	815575	815588	815525	8155254003	815544	8155811014	8155817003	815581	8155818001		8155811012	815536	04557	8155674011	8155264006	815508	815590	815507	8155284004	815540300		8155869002	8155173002
Report: i																																												à								
Rep	CALL																																																			
			쁘.									n t	u												1:		u																									
				-	7992 T	_	<b>!</b> !	- 1	1992 T	1 7661				1007	1	-		-	-	<b>-</b>	-	S [		× - × - × - × - × - × - × - × - × - × -		- 1. - 1.	- +-	- 1-	<b>,-</b>	1992 T	1992 T	1992 T	1992 T	1992 T			-	1992 T	1992 TE	<b>⊢</b> 1		1007 1		1991 TE	-	1992 T	<b>-</b> •			1991 S	<b>!</b> (	<b></b>
	PN DATE		02/03/1992		05/06/1992				07/08/1992	/cr//n	007/12/1003	77/70	06/16/1996	06/24/	(m)						,	12/26/1991	1	1881/57/60	1001/11/001	101/00	02/12/1002	06/24/1992		08/05/	08/05/	03/18/	03/18/1992	05/20/				06/17/1992	02/05/		12/11/1992	05/20/70	05/15/1991	10/02/1991		06/24/1992				12/26/199		
6, 1993																																																				
Jan 6	ACT 10N DATE																																																			
ORY	шш		12/05/1991	06/08/1992	02/24/1992	/1992	07/20/1992	282	266	04/14/1992	7,477	1007	1997	1992	/1992	1992	04/14/1992	1992	08/05/1992	/1992	7885		7,667	2007	1992		180	1992	11992	1992	1992	1992	1992	7992	1992	182	1992	1992	1991	2661	1997	1002	1991	1991	1992	1992	2861	266	1992	1991	1992	7661
INVENT	FILE	•			02/24	09/22	07/20	70/01	25/30			01/07	04/14/1992	04/14	04/13/1			10/02	08/02	10/02		_ •		10/07/1	•			04/14		03/06/1	04/13/1992	01/24			04/06/1992		04/06	0			11/06/1992	-		07/15/1991	06/17/1992	04/21/		06/24/1992		11/15/1991	0	07/20
27 GHz MICROWAVE INVENTORY		i	T Z	: ₹	ř	~	¥ î	<b>≚</b> }	¥	≤ }	≤ <u>}</u>	<b>≤ }</b>	: <u>:</u>	Ě	ž	×	¥	¥	~	¥ i	¥;	<b>≤</b> }	<b>≤</b> }	≤ ≥	<u> </u>	< <u>×</u>	: <u>`</u>	ž	¥	¥	ĭ	×	ž i	¥	<b>≤</b> ≥	<b>:</b>	<b>* *</b>	ĭ	¥	ĭ	<u> </u>	<b>≦</b> ≥	×	¥	¥	<b>≿</b> i	¥ ?	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	×	ř	×
IZ MICE		•	ה מ			ه م ا		<b>.</b> 6	a. c	۲.	L 0	۵	. ۵.	. α.	Δ.				۵.	۰.	٠.		<b>≥</b> 6	<b>.</b> a			. ۵.	. م	•	۵.	Δ.	α.	۵. ۵	ο. α	<b>.</b> 0	۰.	. م	۵.			۵ ۵	ه ۵	. م			S	ه. د پ			۵	ه ۵	۲ ۳
27 G	/ <b>-</b>		DARTA		ING ASS	VY PAR	NG ASS	۲ ۲		7	2	: :	TATES		Š		X PART		IATES	IAMS	EXAS	343	CEVI	CTING		3	¥.		5			ANC	ANC	600	ב אל			DA B.	~	PARTN			AL INC		ELS, L	NICATI	, LTD 1	EK L		XAS	EXAS	NG ASSI
	APPLICANT		SCOIN ASSOCIATES	12 GROUP	ADCAST !	SARL LE	(DCAST)	LAM,	EKSHI Series	יי שלה עו			ASSOC	ISHER	DS GRO	RELES	.o. VI	SCORF	ASSOC	I. WILL	֡֝֓֜֝֓֜֜֝֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֡֓֓֓֓֓֓֡֓֓֡֓֡֓֡֓֡֓	5	I. WILL	TEIECA	MATION	AIII	JOSEP	11	DS GRO	GENERA	RELESS	점 : <b>조</b> :	13 E	IERRA	2 THO!	AULS	4	, FRAY	MELCHE	RELESS		TERRA	NATION	FMAN	<b>ICHANN</b>		VISORY	T, KUB	CORP.	OF TE	Y OF T	DCASTI
	API			SUITE 12	KING BROADCASTING ASSOC	RICHARD CARL LEVY PART	KING BROADCASTING ASSOC	MEGERDICHIAM, JACK	BMB PAKINEKSHIP	ASSUCIATED M	NACOTA STOCK	HORENGEN DAVID G	KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES	MARK B. FISHER	FOUR M MLDS GROUP	ANGE W	M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER	SOC. N	KINGSWOOD ASSOCIATES	WILLIAM H. WILLIAMS	UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS	KIOVISION OF LEANS	WILLIAM M. WI OCTCO DINEDET	FEIER KINTRE! METBOCOM TELECACTING	REINOCOM IELECASIING Inh international inc	BACHOW PALIL	HWALD	TOM ELLIOTT	FOUR M MLDS GROUP	SENVISTA GENERAL	INGE VI	ROBERT E. LA BLANC	ERT E.	WESTERN SIERRA	NVAN	105	CONE, S.E., JR	LINDEMANN, FRAYD	ES L.	ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS	RELLI, PAUL M. DAY TADTAGITA	UESTERN STERRA	LDH INTERNATIONAL INC	KAVID KOFFMAN	ALDA MULTICHANNELS, LTD	ESIGHT	MIT AD	MONIGOMERY, ROBERI L	CT COMM. CORP.	RIOVISION OF TEXAS	UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS	KING BRUADCASTING ASSUC
	<b>8</b>						-																												165 ASK	54 BAC	87 CON	349 LIN												_		
	FILE NUMBER	2000	9218004	9218082	9211074	9218248	9211945	20000	0200040	9200469	021077	0210731	92114	92114	92114	9216656	9216666	9318285	9218193	95186	7210024	7219100	0117777	0418500	0110709	9200600	9210706	92114	92114	9216593	9216	92156	92156	9215945	920026	9200554	9200587	9211349	9215458	9218009	0215150	0215041	9111273	9112777	9218161	9211452	9218094	9200462	9318277	9215179	9216655	451126 446 126

		***************************************
Page 17	SERVICE AREA	ODESSA MSA SSAN ANGELO SSAN ANTONIO SAN AN
invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155172002 815526010 8155778005 8155778005 8155778005 815564009 815564009 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155284007 8155288003 8155288003 8155288003 8155288003 815570004 815588003 8155288003 8155288003 8155288003 8155284001 8155288003 8155288003 8155288003 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004 8155284004
Report:	CALL	
1993	PN DATE	11/27/1991 TE 05/13/1992 T 02/05/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 02/12/1992 T 02/12/1992 TE 02/12/1992 TE 02/12/1992 TE 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 08/05/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T 06/24/1992 T
Jan 6,	ACT ION DATE	
CROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE	TX 06/20/1992 TX 08/10/1992 TX 05/12/1992 TX 03/09/1991 TX 03/09/1991 TX 03/09/1991 TX 03/09/1992 TX 05/11/1992 TX 05/11/1992 TX 05/11/1992 TX 06/12/1992 TX 06/12/1992 TX 06/12/1992 UT 06/17/1992
27 GHz MICRO	FILE NUMBER APPLICANT	9218181 KING BROADCASTING ASSOC P 9218202 KING BROADCASTING ASSOC P 9200720 BACHOW, PAUL S. 9200720 BACHOW, PAUL S. 9211607 BLEVINE, D. CHRISTOPHER P 9211602 FOUR M MLDS GROUP 9218045 ORANGE WIRELESS PARTNERS P 9218108 PMB PARNTERSHIP P 9218146 CONE, S.E., JR. 9200212 CAMBRIDGE MANAGEMENT P 9218160 WILLIAM L. 9218160 WILLIAM L. 921817 METTLER COMMUNICATIONS P 9218190 CHOREKCHYAN, GAYK 9218190 CHOREKCHYAN, GAYK 9218190 CHOREKCHYAN, GAYK P218108 PMB PARTNERSHIP P 9218210 SMITH, WILLIAM L. 9218210 SMITH, WILLIAM L. 9218210 SMITH, WILLIAM L. 9218210 SMITH, WILLIAM L. 9218212 SMITH, RANDEW P 9218212 MILLIAM P. TAVOLLAREAS P 9218308 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. P 9218308 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. P 9218308 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. P 921658 PATRICIA B. MAILANI 9218308 JOS. D. CARNEY & ASSOC. P 921658 PATRICIA B. MAILANI 921659 BACHOW, PAUL S. 921659 BACHOW, PAUL S. 921659 BACHOW, PAUL S. 921655 MILLIAM MCKISSOUCK 921665 M.J. SECURITIES INC 921665 M.J. SECURITIES INC 921665 M.M. & C.O. VICK PARTNER P 921665 MILLIAM MCKISSOUCK 921665 MILLIAM MCKISSOUCK 921665 MILL RAYISION P921826 MCKISSOCK, MILLIAM J. P9218204057 ORAM J. P921820 MCKISS

		\$55555555555555555555555555555555555555	ž
Page 18	SERVICE AREA	TACOMA GREEN BAY MADISON MADISON MADISON MSA MILHAUKEE	CHEYENNE
Report: invent27.ace	FEE NUMBER	8155284005 8155172007 8155398009 8155398009 815569004 888001004 8155944002 8155944002 8155944002 8155944003 8155946003 815526004 815526004	8155236006
Report:	CALL		
1993	PN DATE	1 08/05/1992 S 1 03/04/1992 T 1 12/11/1991 TE 1 1 05/20/1992 T	<b>-</b>
Jan 6, 1993	ACT 10N DATE		
27 GHZ MICROWAVE INVENTORY	FILE	NA 08/24/1992 NI 07/20/1992 NI 06/30/1992 NI 03/16/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 01/13/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 05/04/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992 NI 06/17/1992	W 08/10/1992
27 GHZ MICRO	FILE NUMBER APPLICANT		9218214 HUGHES, LEONARD P